

JPRS-UPA-90-056
24 SEPTEMBER 1990



JPRS Report—

Soviet Union

Political Affairs

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 3

REPRODUCED BY
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
NATIONAL TECHNICAL INFORMATION SERVICE
SPRINGFIELD, VA. 22161

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A
Approved for public release;
Distribution Unlimited

19980604 124

Political Affairs

JPRS-UPA-90-056

CONTENTS

24 September 1990

NATIONAL PARTY AND STATE AFFAIRS

Poll Shows Declining Confidence in Soviets, Party [L. Zhilina; <i>IZVESTIYA</i> , 16 Jul 90]	1
Reasons for Resigning From, Remaining in Party Examined [V. Tikhonov, A. Z. Anfinogenov; <i>LITERATURNAYA GAZETA</i> No 31, 1 Aug 90]	3

REPUBLIC PARTY AND STATE AFFAIRS

Estonian Conservative People's Party Formed [A. Heinapuu; <i>RAHVA HAAL</i> , 12 Jun 90]	7
Deputy Comments on Moscow Soviet Decrees [A.M. Bryachikin; <i>LITERATURNAYA ROSSIYA</i> No 28, 13 Jul 90]	7
Estonian Presidium Decree on Talks with RSFSR [<i>SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA</i> , 20 Jul 90]	8
Tallinn-Kiev Direct Ties Discussed [L. Rannamets; <i>SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA</i> , 20 Jul 90]	9
Narva Komsomol Protests Draft Citizenship Law [<i>MOLODEZH ESTONII</i> , 20 Jul 90]	9
Estonian CP Veterans Support Independence [<i>SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA</i> , 21 Jul 90]	9
Estonian Minister Comments on 'Canada' Emigration Group [A.I. Kuznetsov; <i>MOLODEZH ESTONII</i> , 20 Jul 90]	10
Latvian CP Chiefs on Party Relations, CPSU Congress [A. Rubiks, I. Kezbers; <i>SOVETSKAYA MOLODEZH</i> , 3 Jul 90]	11
Role of Latvia's Citizens Congress Scored [L. Fedoseyev; <i>SOVETSKAYA MOLODEZH</i> , 4 Jul 90]	14
Latvian 'Campaign' To Rename Places, Remove Lenin Statues Scored [V. Proskura; <i>RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA</i> , 20 Jul 90]	17
Latvian Front Scores Citizens Congress [<i>SOVETSKAYA MOLODEZH</i> , 28 Jul 90]	18
Decisions of Moldavian Supreme Soviet [<i>SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA</i> , 20 Jul 90]	18
Party Metes Out Punishment for Unlawful 'Chernobyl' Cruise [<i>SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA</i> , 20 Jun 90]	20
Lvov's Political Opposition Viewed [S. Osipov; <i>SOVETSKAYA MOLODEZH</i> , 3 Jul 90]	20
Deputies Deplore CP Congresses [V. Meshcheryakov, et al; <i>PRAVDA UKRAYINY</i> , 6 Jul 90]	22
Ukrainian Time Change Causes Problems [O. Gusev; <i>SOVETSKAYA KULTURA</i> , 28 Jul 90]	23

NATIONALITY ISSUES

University of Peoples of North Discussed [S. Gorokhov; <i>SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA</i> , 31 Jul 90]	24
Anticommunist Demonstration in Moldavia [I. Koman; <i>SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA</i> , 24 Jul 90]	25
Reaction to Moldavian People's Front Congress [<i>SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA</i> , 20 Jul 90]	25
Moldavians Discuss Leaving USSR [N. Kuzmin; <i>MOLDEZH MOLDAVII</i> , 21 Jul 90]	26
Roundtable Participants Score Armenian Pan-National Movement Work [M. Diloyan and Z. Vartanyan; <i>KOMSOMOLETS</i> , 24 Jul 90]	28
Armenian Dissident Manucharov Comments on Imprisonment, NKAO Crisis [A. Manucharov; <i>KOMSOMOLETS</i> , 2 Aug 90]	37
Lvov Oblast Sets Up Own Customs Center [F. Ivanov; <i>IZVESTIYA</i> , 17 Aug 90]	42
Lvov Area Streets To Be Renamed [M. Zadorozhny; <i>KRASNAYA ZVEZDA</i> , 22 Aug 90]	43
Ukrainian National Flag Raised in Kiev [D. Yakovenko; <i>PRAVDA UKRAINY</i> , 27 Jul 90]	43
Rukh Rallies in Kharkov Denounced [L. Zamyatin; <i>PRAVDA UKRAINY</i> , 8 Aug 90]	44
Kiev Rally Protests Destruction Of Lenin Monuments [V. Demyadenko; <i>SELSKAYA ZHIZN</i> , 15 Sep 90]	45

LAW AND ORDER

Public Relations Departments Opened In Republic KGBs	46
--	----

MEDIA AND JOURNALISM

Editor Details Work, Functioning of Independent Journal GLASNOST [Sergey Grigoryants; <i>ZHURNALIST</i> No 6, Jun 90]	47
--	----

Changing Role of Media in Multiparty Conditions Explored [V. Motyashov, et al.; <i>ZHURNALIST</i> No 6, Jun 90]	50
Chairman Details Formation of Independent Georgian Journalists' Union [N. Cherkezishvili; <i>ZHURNALIST</i> No 6, Jun 90]	57
HISTORY AND IDEOLOGY	
'Memorial' Group Uncovers Mass Grave Near Yaroslavl [V. Ionov; <i>SOVETSKAYA KULTURA</i> No 30, 28 Jul 90]	62
ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS	
New Lithuanian Publication on Environment [A. Kezys; <i>TIESA</i> , 8 Sep 90]	63
State Environmental Expenditures Summarized [<i>EKONOMIKA I ZHIZN</i> No 31, Jul 90]	63
Activist Updates Efforts To Clean Up Kazakhstan's Lake Balkhash [Anuar Alimzhanov; <i>KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA</i> , 28 Jul 90]	63
Yablokov, Others Score Marchuk Stand on Leningrad Barrier Project [A. Yablokov, et al.; <i>IZVESTIYA</i> , 8 Aug 90]	66
Director Explains Tasks of New Moldavian State Environmental Department [Professor I. I. Dedyu; <i>MOLODEZH MOLDAVII</i> , 2 Aug 90]	68
Findings of White Sea Ecological Disaster Commission Reported [A. Alimov, et al.; <i>PRAVDA</i> , 10 Aug 90]	70
SOCIAL AND CULTURAL ISSUES	
Russian Culture Association Holds Founding Congress	72
Bondarev Elected Head, Addresses Meeting [Yu. Bondarev; <i>LITERATURNAYA ROSSIYA</i> No 25, 22 Jun 90]	72
Further Congress Speeches [Yu.L. Prokushhev, et al.; <i>LITERATURNAYA ROSSIYA</i> No 27, 6 Jul 90]	74
USSR Society To Combat Drug Addiction Formed [V. Ivanov; <i>TRUD</i> , 31 Jul 90]	80
AIDS Problem Viewed as Growing in Volgograd [M. Verzhba; <i>RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA</i> , 4 Aug 90]	82
Health Minister on Reforms in Public Health System [I. Denisov; <i>PRAVDA</i> , 7 Jul 90]	82
Minister Details Armenian Health Issues, Quake Recovery Progress [A. Aznavuryan; <i>KOMMUNIST</i> , 24 Jul 90]	87
High Infant Mortality in Tajik SSR Examined [Lev Aleynik; <i>SOYUZ</i> No 30, Jul 90]	89
Uzbek Independence, Social Problems Reviewed [<i>SOVET OZBEKİSTONI</i> , 13 May 90]	92
Uzbek Youth Unemployment, Illegal Labor Market Described [D. Molchanov; <i>KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA</i> , 28 Jul 90]	94
Ukrainian Moratorium on Building AES, Radar Stations [<i>PRAVDA UKRAINY</i> , 8 Aug 90]	96
Effects on Chernobyl in Bukovina [V. Pelekh; <i>PRAVDA UKRAINY</i> , 8 Aug 90]	96
Hungary To Help Chernobyl Victims [<i>PRAVDA UKRAINY</i> , 25 Jul 90]	97

Poll Shows Declining Confidence in Soviets, Party
90US1167A Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 Jul 90
Morning Edition p 2

[Article by L. Zhilina, lead scientific associate at the Center for Sociological Research of the Academy of Social Sciences under the CPSU Central Committee: "Soviets: Forecasts and Reality"]

[Text] It must be admitted that the soviets, that is, our state power, have withstood the pressure of public criticism at all levels, although during the years of perestroika it has assumed very sharp forms. Owing to the fact that at the 19th party conference the CPSU adopted the decision on transferring absolute state power to the soviets and because their unsuccessful activity is also connected with the party, they have even won the population's sympathy and its desire to take part in strengthening and improving them.

How do matters stand at this moment? A sociological poll shows that Soviet power does not yet hold the leading position with respect to other forms and types of power. Only 20 percent of those polled can agree that in their locality at present power belongs to the soviets. Twice as many people (41 percent) maintain that, as before, it belongs to party bodies...

"Bodies of Soviet power can best protect the interests of the 'simple' man"—11 percent of those polled said so in November 1989. In March 1990 they became 31 percent and in June of the same year again 11 percent. The flash of hope to bring power closer to man—connected with the elections in March of this year—has again died down by now. At the same time, people do not count on any other authorities. More than one-half (53 percent) of those polled do not rely on anyone's help in a difficult life situation.

Evaluating the authority of the chairman of their rayon (city) executive committee, those polled answered as follows: A total of 16 percent said that he had authority, 42 percent that he did not, and 42 percent had difficulty answering, because they did not know him. The last indicator is noteworthy. No other category of leaders has produced such a high level of people's ignorance.

However, let us go back to the matter of the flash of hope in March 1990. As before, we have not learned to perceive the truth in the processes that are taking place and in the public mood. For example, it is considered almost an axiom that elections to local soviets were held on the wave of disappointment at the results of the last campaign of elections of supreme authorities and that this gave rise to a sharp decline in political activity. Therefore, the population did not even want to go to elections and those that came voted without interest and without any hopes. This is not at all so. According to all statistical data, about one-fourth of the population did not participate in the elections. This seems incredibly much as compared with the high percent of the turnout at elections during the period of stagnation, which were

held by the method of "herding" the population into election precincts. In fact, the word "much" should rather be applied to another figure, that is, 75 percent of the turnout, because, first, it was the people's own will and, second, because, according to our survey data, among the voters only 19 percent of the people called their choice of the candidate accidental. The rest drew the sociologists' attention to a whole slew of motives.

Those 25 percent of the citizens who did not go to election precincts and who on this basis, for old times' sake, were recorded as abstainers are by no means such. Their behavior had no less political charge. We have simply not become accustomed to regard refusal to vote an activity. Meanwhile, this refusal had its political motives. Here is only one example. One-half of those who did not go to vote showed no confidence in the power system itself. In their opinion, nothing will change for the better no matter who is elected to it. One-fourth poorly rated the work of congresses of people's deputies and sessions of the USSR Supreme Soviet, believing that after such work on their part it was impossible to rely on local soviets. Therefore, one can say about the past elections that the level of the population's conscious participation in them was quite high. The content of each individual consciousness is another matter. In sum, it gave us precisely these compositions of soviets and no others. Such as they are, finally, they must without fail "manifest their power" with the greatest benefit for their territories and their population, not forgetting the benefit of the homeland as a whole. It must be remembered that Soviet power is now undergoing a test. And this is serious.

Today the background of confidence in the new power can still be called satisfactory. A total of 42 percent of those polled and exactly one-half in rural areas place their hopes on the new compositions of the soviets, assuming that they can change the life of their rayon (city) for the better.

Those polled were asked to place themselves in the situation of the chairman of the soviet of people's deputies and answer where they would begin first of all. Many believe that, first of all, the soviets should receive power, because little can be solved within the framework of existing power. The following answer is widespread: "The soviet does not have power or money to solve problems." Nevertheless, even under these conditions they would undertake something. For example, in the area of life support for the population people would begin to solve the following problems according to their significance: housing, food, ecology, public health, social protection, labor discipline, education, and culture.

True, most answers show that many people think in the traditional channel. The desire to do everything the same, only more so, and control—control everywhere—are observed. But to find a new alternative for the solution of a specific problem—such proposals are encountered less often. Nevertheless, they are encountered and this points to the fact that, if the soviets

actively expand sociological services now, their activity could prove to be very effective owing to the readiness of many people to think and seek ways of best solving numerous problems which lie on the soviets' shoulders.

The soviets have hardly ever had the opportunity to lean on such a strong wave of a popular counter-movement. Not to take advantage of it now means to expose the soviets to an attack, which the CPSU has experienced for several years. The question of unsuitability of the institution of Soviet power itself for modern reality can arise. That is why the soviets should have available advance information. It can give a great deal. For example, let us take the following aspects of voters' interests. People have the desire (data in percent):

		Rural Population		
	Total population	kolkhoz members and sovkhoz workers	lessees, farmers, and cooperative workers	agricultural specialists
to know their authorities "personally"	58	66	68	76
to control their work	38	50	53	57
to work in committees and commissions established by soviets of people's deputies	14	16	19	17
to have constant information on the work of local authorities	76	79	87	92
Know their rayon soviet deputy	43	75	65	85

It is evident from the presented data that the rural population to a greater extent than all the rest wants to keep a close distance between itself and the authorities.

In rural areas the overwhelming majority knows its local soviet deputy (whereas, on the whole, this knowledge comprises barely 40 percent). The request of rural residents for constant information on the activity of their authorities reaches 90 percent and the request to "personally" know the leading authorities, 70 percent (compare this with the presented data on how people know the chairman of the rayon executive committee and how authoritative he is for them).

Of course, many happy people do not have the need to know their deputy in the local or republic soviet (44 percent). Nevertheless, to the majority not knowing him signifies disbelief that the deputy is able to solve, do, or improve something.

Life puts on the agenda the problem of greater personification of power. A total of 66 percent of those polled came out in favor of the mayor (he can be called differently) being elected by the entire population with the slogan: "Every city needs an individual personally responsible for its affairs." This indicator rises among such population categories as scientists (87 percent), students (82 percent), officers (82 percent), and economic managers and engineering and technical personnel (76 percent).

This is a completely natural demand of the times. First, people have become confused as to the number of leading authorities: chairman of the soviet, chairman of the executive committee, and deputies of both of them... Second, the popularity of chairmen is exceptionally rare. For some reasons they are poorly known, while, as we have already shown, there is a great need to know "the authorities personally." Third, precisely the acceptance of the idea of "human measurement" forms the request for profoundly personified power in localities. "We need mayors who need us," this is what people write in questionnaires.

Those polled were also asked to state their opinion of the USSR Supreme Soviet, evaluating several laws adopted by it not so long ago. The law on general principles of local self-administration and local economy in the USSR, of which deputies are proud and, which, in fact, is one of the most elaborated and important laws, was evaluated positively by 48 percent of the people and negatively, by 41 percent. A total of 11 percent were not familiar with this law. How to count on a close and productive interaction of local soviets and the population? After all, 32 percent of those polled do not even know the law on income tax. This law was positively evaluated by 31 percent of the citizens and negatively, by 37 percent.

Such a reaction points to the existence of epic calm in the public mood, which is determined mostly by the habitually low standard of living, undeveloped needs, strong leveling tendencies, and lumpenization of the bulk of the population, not perceiving itself in the system of high monetary income. The high taxes on big incomes do not affect the population very much. It does not assume that it can have such income and "moneybags should be shaken." Not for nothing do 38 percent of those polled support the OFT [expansion unknown] organization, which proposes to "expropriate homebred millionaires," while [illegible number] view it calmly without a moment's thought.

In the same investigation a rating of nine government members, including several ministers, was conducted. According to the sum of positive evaluations they are

ranked as follows: N. I. Ryzhkov, 61 percent; N. N. Gubenko, 54 percent; V. V. Bakatin, 36 percent; L. I. Abalkin, 35 percent; M. F. Nenashev, 25 percent; A. P. Birkova, 17 percent; V. I. Shcherbakov, 16 percent; G. A. Yagodin, 16 percent; Yu. D. Maslyukov, 15 percent. The poll was conducted immediately after the publication of the government program for the transition to a market. Its nonacceptance has not yet been reflected in N. I. Ryzhkov's authority, but has been greatly reflected in L. I. Abalkin's authority (the premier still remains within the range of confidence). On the whole, it makes sense for the government and ministries to give thought to the problem of making themselves known. It is better that people evaluate both positively and negatively than not at all because of unfamiliarity. Now is the time for personification of power.

The institution of presidency is a new phenomenon for our society, which is not yet mastered and grasped both from the standpoint of the functioning of the institution itself and its perception by mass consciousness. This circumstance largely explains the difference in M. S. Gorbachev's evaluations. In one case it was given to him as the party leader for his contribution to the party's and society's renewal and in the other, for activity in the post of president. In the first case his June rating expressed in the sum of positive evaluations makes up 60 percent and of negative evaluations, 27 percent. A total of 13 percent could not answer. It is slightly lower than past evaluations, but according to all international standards is considered high. In the other case the evaluation of his activity as president appears more unpleasant. A total of 14 percent gave it a good evaluation, 35 percent, a satisfactory evaluation, 28, a poor evaluation, and 23 percent could not evaluate it. Here even the sum of good and satisfactory evaluations makes up only 49 percent and almost one-fourth do not attempt to judge his presidential activity. This is bad both for the president himself and for the prestige of state power, which culminates in the president.

The main conclusion, which we see, lies in the following: The entire system of Soviet power from the lowest to the highest stage needs a careful, systematic, and constant analysis so that its acutely needed dynamic improvement may be based on competent knowledge. In connection with the party's transfer of power to the soviets the task of helping them should almost become its main task.

Yes, the party can be in opposition to some decisions and actions of Soviet bodies, but cannot permit itself a confrontation with the soviets and a fight with them for the priority of power. Opposition only stimulates an improvement in management, while confrontation can destroy it. If party bodies, as before, "win over" power and rejoice at the "ineptness" of the soviets, we will lose not only the party, but also Soviet power, in the country.

Reasons for Resigning From, Remaining in Party Examined

90UN2521A Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA
in Russian No 31, 1 Aug 90 p 2

[Article in two parts, one by Academician V. Tikhonov and one by Artem Zakharovich Anfinogenov, secretary of the governing board of the Moscow Branch of the RSFSR Writers' Union, under the rubric "The Hot Zone": "The Choice of Today: I Am Resigning from the Party—Why? I Am Remaining in the Party—Why?"]

[Text] It is no secret to anyone that today the Communist Party of the Soviet Union is not experiencing its best times. In the first 6 months of this year the Leningrad party organization, for example, diminished by 23,685 people, and in Moscow during that time 22,000 members resigned from the CPSU, and in July another some 10,000 did so. In the first half year the number of communists throughout the country declined by 234,000. Why do some people resign? Why do others remain? Today the Academician V. Tikhonov and the writer A. Anfinogenov talk about that.

[V. Tikhonov] It was not easy for me to make the decision to leave the Communist Party, since I had been a member for about 40 years. And, I must say, I served the party with faith and truth my whole life and not once did it occur to me to clash with this party no matter how complex the situation.

But too many events have happened recently which made me question whether I could be in a party with people like Polozkov and many others. The Constituent Congress of the Communist Party of Russia and the 28th CPSU Congress were the final push. The first congress, which was legally illegitimate and had not received the sanctions of party members as a congress to ratify a new party, proposed as its leaders people distinguished by particularly clear conservatism and unwillingness to move consistently toward any serious democratic transformations in the country. It is certainly no accident that in this connection people such as Professor Sergeyev or others who think just as this economist does were proposed as ideological leaders. And then, right after the Russian Congress, the substance, character, and spirit of the 28th CPSU Congress became the motivation for my decision.

The thing that was particularly cutting, I would say, was the clearly expressed intolerance of unorthodox thinking. The readiness to explosively suppress any dissent. And the surprisingly traditional aggressiveness of the communist idea. In the many fairly serious situations which arose at the congress, the situation was similar to what it most likely was in party organizations in Civil War times.

The tolerance of both congresses toward provocations also struck me. Examples are not only the speeches at the Russian Congress by General Makashov and others, but the altogether direct provocation at the "big" congress

against Yakovlev with the fake interview of him. The explicit unwillingness of the leaders of the congress to find the source and culprit of this provocation was also striking. If provocation becomes a permissible method of struggle against opponents at a party congress and the very fact of provocation does not make the leading figures want to expose it and find the author of the slander, then that speaks of the profound moral crisis of those gathered at the congress, and one of those provocations would be sufficient for me to decide not to be in the same party with those people. But provocations arose like a natural organic feature of all the activity of the congress.

The inclination for property disputes was striking. To me, for example, the value of party property is of no consequence. The party accumulated it for a long time, and conditions were such that the party could exploit not only its own members but even the state's centralized net income. But where did this stinginess and this serious talk about party property which is never to be surrendered come from? I think that these furious property disputes are telling for members of a party which, it seems, has always made property moderation, if not to say equality, and a kind of "ideological disinterest" in pecuniary things the foundation of ideology.

Nor can I back the supporters of the Democratic Platform, which chose very cunning tactics of conflict with the leading circles of the CPSU and delaying formal resignation from the party in the hope that they might have a share in the property. That reminds me of a scandalous family divorce.

But the main reason for my resignation is substantially deeper. It is the economic crisis which the country has been moving toward, which was inevitable, and which the country has reached. The main cause of this economic crisis is the system of the party-state monopoly. We formed a system where the dominance of monopolism is substantially stronger, substantially more powerful, all-encompassing, and all-penetrating thanks to the party and its desire for dictatorship. Deliberately imposed state monopoly is the economic basis and foundation of political dictatorship. Our economic monopolies fused together with the state and subordinated the state apparatus to their purposes. And the elite of the monopolistically dominant party subordinated these monopolies to themselves. The state is impotent for it does not have the political power which is in the hands of the party apparatus, and the state is helpless for it cannot carry out its own independent policy and is compelled to merely serve the monopolies which have developed, expressing their interests and carrying out their policies. It is the dominance of monopolism in the economy and the dominance of political dictatorship of one party in politics that are the main components of the social crisis which we are now experiencing.

We cannot count on any democratic transformations in society while this monopolistic order is preserved. But is the party prepared to abandon political dictatorship,

especially since this dictatorship is by no means the party's, but a dictatorship of the party apparatus and the nomenklatura? Even when Article 6 was rescinded, the party structures which have a monopoly position in politics were preserved and their property-based economic power was preserved. I think the congress demonstrated the party's unwillingness to abandon political power over society. We still cherished some hope that the congress would be able to turn the party to the left to the degree which needed to modernize it on the path of democracy.

But the congress showed that these illusions are groundless. And any activity within the party to reorganize it is useless. The character of the discussion of today's problems at the Constituent Congress of the Russian Communist Party and the 28th CPSU Congress showed that it is altogether impossible to hope for that. The genetic structure of the "new type of party" as it was created oriented to revolutionary changes, suppression, and coming to power prevents that. These are not incidental features but deep-seated qualities of this party. And even though today the terror is manifested not in the physical annihilation of people but in the "clamping down" on unorthodox thinking, it is still a form too.

People say to me that there are still a number of democratic postulates in the congress's decision. I reply that we have always had enough democratic postulates and slogans proclaimed in the decisions of congresses, but there never have been constructive mechanisms for realizing these slogans. And note an interesting feature of both the Russian and the 28th congresses: there is a lot of criticism, even of Gorbachev, very bitter criticism which approaches boorishness and hooliganism. But there are no constructive plans. Nowhere and in no way have the congresses proposed any constructive program. Only very cautiously, very limply, and, I would say, in a very cowardly way did the congresses express their neutral-supporting attitude toward reforms of the economy in general. But nothing constructive.

And really, can a congress support a program of truly democratic transformations in the economy and in social life if they do not simply threaten but in fact must result in the elimination of this party's monopoly on political power in the country?

All this brought me to the conclusion that there is only one way to weaken the monopolism of the Communist Party in the country's political and economic life: that way is to quantitatively reduce the party apparatus which rules on behalf of the party. The hour has come when we cannot delay in resigning from the CPSU.

I began with the statement that I was in the CPSU for almost 40 years. I was at the front at the age of 16. Forty years is a very long time. And when I sent my party card to my primary party organization I felt as though something broke inside of me. When you are in an organization for so long, its life becomes your life and it is you.

But what can I do? If you want to remake society, first of all you have to remake and change yourself.

* * *

[Artem Anfinogenov] My telephone conversations with friends begin the same way: "So, you haven't resigned yet?" "No, I haven't," I answer, "and you'll not see the day." "Well, you're a tough one."

Perhaps I am in a weak position, but I start from my own biography.

For a frontline soldier, participating in the Victory is, until the grave, the greatest gift of fate, no matter how your life develops. I had not been in battle yet, I was only flying to the front when I chanced to meet Amet-Khan Sultan, the hero of Stalingrad. "How many have you shot down, sergeant?" Amet shot a rapid glance from under his wide-set eyebrows. This was his first and only question. I raised my arms guiltily. He turned and left: a pilot who had not inflicted loss on the enemy was of no interest to Amet-Khan. It was not bravado or caprice but the norm established among aerial combatants by such aces as the communist Amet-Khan Sultan.

I was admitted into the party as one who had distinguished himself in battle in 1943. This was after I was shot down in an air battle on the Mius on 1 August 1943. I was seriously wounded, parachuted out, and landed among our troops, and lay in hospitals for half of a year. Recently (not 10 and not 20 but 47 years later) a letter came—it was fantastic! It was from a sick-nurse, a girl who was found who was sponsored to work in the hospital, Valentina Grigoryevna Perevyshina. She wrote: "Greetings, little frontline brother. Back then I could never call you by name, just little brother. I do not know whether you remember, Artem Zakharovich, how I came to your bed the first time. I was frightened. When I had fed you with a little spoon and done everything, I turned and cried very bitterly over your sufferings. But the cook said: 'Silly, if you cry like that over every one, you won't last long.' But such torments were so pitiful. And I said: 'I wish the war would end soon.'" Those were the circumstances in which I, a 19-year old boy, was admitted. That battle proved to be an effective mission. The tank division "Death's Head" broke through and we stopped the enemy with our strike.

The second thing. Not one of the people who recommended me to the party is among the living. The pilot Anatoliy Pomykanov, a former student of the Moscow Architectural Institute, died storming artillery positions on the Molochnaya River. Nikolay Samsonov, assault pilot, died on his hundredth combat flight trying to liberate the Crimea. A fine fellow, 10-year school graduate from Leningrad, the commander of the squadron where I was elected party organizer, Hero of the Soviet Union Georgiy Gerasimovich Chernov died in the Baltic Region in 1944, on 21 December. They used to give the Hero twice, after 180 flights, and it should have been presented to him too. He died on his 209th flight. A man of crystal-clear honesty, he said to the chief of the

division's political department: you, Comrade Colonel, don't goad me. I don't work by language, but you criticize me because my wall newspaper looks bad. That was all he was guilty of, but they did not put him up for Hero twice.

Of the 17 graduates of the Perm Pilot Aviation School who arrived at the 947th Air Assault Regiment, three are still alive: Hero of the Soviet Union Gumer Minnibayev, holder of the Fifth Order, Boris Kuchin, and I. All my combat friends went into battle as communists. Their only privilege was to be the first to take off to attack the most difficult target and make not one foray over it but four—until complete destruction of the enemy.

Those who recommended me to the party laid down their lives as patriots and as communists. And if now, in an atmosphere of the multiparty system which is taking shape in our country, I were to assume the role of initiator of the creation of some new party, I would call it the CCY—the communists of combat years. I saw all kinds of communists, of course. But those who recommended me and to whom I compared myself and tried to be like paid for their party membership with their lives.

I will use all the strength I have to insure that the party in whose ranks I am is worthy of the lives which were given up for its idea.

I took part in all the demonstrations which we have had recently in Moscow, and I believe that they are major milestones of our civic development. This is not froth, as we love to say, it is not obsession with rallies; it is the manifestation of the growing self-consciousness of the people. The fact that the party rejected Article 6 of the Constitution is a direct result of people's statements at rallies. I am happy that I took part in them.

The congress is over and people feel differently about it. But I believe that it ended with a sense of faith in the victory of common sense. The congress showed that common sense can win within the party just as it can throughout society, and that is the main hope for the future normal development of events. With all its drama the congress showed how controllable the party mass still is. Not even the rank-and-file mass but the delegate mass.

I was bitter at the rally of 15 July when the crowd chanted, "Down with the CPSU!" Adamovich said that I had to speak. I refused. I could not have been understood by that audience. But one cannot allow people to hiss at the memory of frontline friends. Talking about them does not mean just looking back. We must remember them today, because the cause of perestroika and the intelligent reconstruction of life demands just that selfless attitude. And because everyone who recommended me and died later, all of us people of the frontline generation belonged, according to Aleksandr Nikolayevich Yakovlev's fine definition, to the party of an idea rather than a party of power. If you are in a party of an idea, you must do the work which you believe in till it is finished.

I am a deputy of the Sokolnicheskiy Rayon Soviet. The Turgenev Library hangs over me. That is a shame and a disgrace. A crime committed 18 years ago in the center of Moscow, on Turgenev Square. As people tell it, Comrade Grishin was driving along the scheduled route of President's Nixon's entourage (people were waiting for him at that point) and indicated the building which stood on the square looking like a private home. "Take it away!" And they took it away. In two days. The bulldozers came and demolished the Turgenev Library given by the grateful merchants to the city of Moscow in 1885, 2 years after Turgenev's death. It was the center of cultural life in which generations of Moscow intelligentsia members grew up. Now I, a deputy of Sokolnicheskiy Rayon and a member of a cultural commission, have been charged with restoring the library. Its unique reserves, 150,000 units of storage, are now scattered in the most varied places. We got a decree, the fifth one, from the Moscow Soviet offering the Turgenev Library a building at No 6 Bobrovyy Lane. This fifth decree has been in existence for 2 years already, but there

is nothing. And once again the materials have to be shipped from one place to another. But there are constant leaks there and the books are ruined.

Understand, I am not digressing from our "party" topic of conversation. I, a communist, am the one who is obliged to expiate the horrible crime against culture committed by the leader of the Moscow Party Organization. It would be immoral to pass this on to someone else's shoulders. I believe that the party is guilty before the people and the country. And each communist, each honest communist, who understands this guilt of his before the Fatherland should bear it, only not passively, then, but actively. He must do everything to expiate and correct this guilt. But in itself the communist idea, that is, the idea of solidarity, the idea of justice, the idea of equality, the idea of human brotherhood, is eternal. I certainly admit that for certain reasons events now may develop which will be extremely bad for the CPSU. But sooner or later it will revive. Because this idea is not an idea of today. It is eternal.

Estonian Conservative People's Party Formed

90UN2585A Tallinn RAHVA HAAL in Estonian
12 Jun 90 p 3

[Article by Andres Heinapuu: "Enn Tarto Elected Chairman of EKRE"]

[Text] The general assembly of the Estonian Conservative People's Party [EKRE] was held on 9 June in Tallinn. Enn Tarto, the founding member of the party, was elected chairman of EKRE.

A presentation about the political situation in Estonia was made by Kaido Kama, and a review about the balance of forces in the media was given by Andres Heinapuu. Jekki Rjazin spoke about the problems of holding elections for the state council and introduced a preliminary draft of the position based on Enn Tarto's idea. Two documents were approved: "The Position of EKRE Regarding the Political Situation in Estonia" and "The Position of EKRE Regarding Elections for the State Council." The first of these repeats that EKRE deems it necessary that both the Estonian Congress and the supreme soviet continue their operations through the transition period, with the first geared to solving the basic issues of Estonia's statehood, and the second to securing a normal civil life.

EKRE does not recognize the Supreme Soviet to be the highest legislative power of the Republic of Estonia, in its *de jure* form, nor does it recognize the present government of Estonia as the lawful government of the Republic of Estonia. The normative measures approved by the latter will be valid only until the constitutional power of the state is restored. Giving international recognition to the present government of Estonia would amount to recognizing the continuing annexation and occupation of Estonia. EKRE recognizes the government of the Republic of Estonia in exile, and the prime minister acting as president to be the agents of continuity for the Republic of Estonia.

It is emphasized in "The Position of EKRE Regarding Elections for the State Council" that constitutional organs of state power cannot be formed under conditions of occupation and annexation. Thus formed, they would inevitably bring about perpetuation of annexation. "EKRE deems it necessary that the decision to hold State Council elections be made jointly by the prime minister of the Republic of Estonia acting as president (in exile), the chairman of the Estonian Committee, and the chairman of the Estonian Supreme Soviet," the statement says.

Also discussed was H. Valk's article in KODUMAA, in which EKRE is incriminated for advocating non-compliance with the Supreme Soviet and the government. It was thought that such slander could be a foretaste of repressions to come from the opposition. The general assembly authorized the board to take decisive counter-measures.

K. Eller spoke about the position of the board on the issue of ownership reform. He said that preparation of a plan for ownership reform would be beyond the powers of both the board and EKRE in its present form. However, it was felt that since the plan for land reform, based on the EKRE ownership concept, has had quite an effect on all political forces in Estonia, the party should make a thorough study of the ownership issue, and even involve some outsiders. K. Eller presented the basic principles for ownership reform, and a discussion ensued. The board was asked to form two task forces that would be dealing with the problems of restoring property and protecting Estonia's national wealth, including involvement of experts from outside the party.

EKRE also sent its greetings to Patriarch Alexius, head of the Russian Orthodox Church, who hails from Estonia.

Deputy Comments on Moscow Soviet Decrees

90UN2514A Moscow LITERATURNAYA ROSSIYA
in Russian No 28, 13 Jul 90 p 3

[Interview with Aleksey Mikheyevich Bryachikhin, delegate to the 28th CPSU Congress, people's deputy of the Moscow Soviet, first secretary of a CPSU raykom, and chairman of the Sevastopolskiy Raysoviet of Moscow, by P. Yemelin; time, date, and place not specified: "Measure Seven Times..."]

[Text] The decisions adopted recently by the Moscow City Soviet are by no means being understood by everyone in the same way. Reader responses to the articles entitled "The Candidates Sang Sweetly" (No 23) and "It's Good Even If It's Just Your Own Potato" (No 25) published in our weekly during the days the 28th CPSU Congress was working prove that. LITERATURNAYA ROSSIYA correspondent P. Yemelin met with the delegate to the Congress, people's deputy of the Moscow Soviet, first secretary of a CPSU raykom, and chairman of the Sevastopolskiy Rayon Soviet of Moscow, A. M. Bryachikhin.

[Correspondent] Aleksey Mikheyevich, how do you feel about trade in the capital based on passports?

[Bryachikhin] Perhaps it is necessary for the present. But, before we do that, it would not hurt to recheck everything thoroughly. It is no secret that in Moscow the actual consumption of products and industrial goods is much higher per person than the average throughout the Union. Meat, for example. A Muscovite, let us say, is allotted 162 kilograms a year, while the "norm" in the country, if my memory does not deceive me, is 56 kilograms. But all the supplements are provided for the capital figuring that from 40 to 70 percent of what is issued is taken outside the city limits. If trade based on passports is introduced, each resident of Moscow should be allotted that same 56 kilos of meat. But that measure would not achieve anything; after all, the nearby regions are completely empty. People will again come to the

capital for foodstuffs and goods. And here it is important to find a common language with neighbors and suppliers.

[Correspondent] Did you participate in this session of the Moscow Soviet yourself?

[Bryachikhin] Yes, I participated. And I voted against it. The decision was made at the suggestion of the chairman of the Moscow Gorispolkom Yu. M. Luzhkov.

[Correspondent] According to your information, how have the people responded to this decision of the Moscow delegates?

[Bryachikhin] The response has taken both extremes. Muscovites are for the most part in favor of it. Everything is fine, they say, it's gotten better in the stores. Since allocations have not really been reduced, everything is being done figuring on visitors. But the visitors, of course, are offended. And so that is where their attitude toward Muscovites comes from. I was told that they are stopping Moscow cars in Kalinin Oblast, taking away foodstuffs, and threatening them: "Get out or else..."

[Correspondent] What is the future fate of this decision, in your opinion?

[Bryachikhin] I don't know. The next session of the Moscow Soviet is now underway and this subject is being discussed there.

[Correspondent] But what is your prediction all the same?

[Bryachikhin] I think we should put the brakes on everything.

[Correspondent] Remember how the deputy chairman of the Moscow Soviet, S. B. Stankevich, explained this decision to the RSFSR people's deputies and talked of the need for Moscow to have contract relations with other regions?

[Bryachikhin] That's still only an idea. Moscow can in fact feed itself, but there is no legal or economic mechanism for that, nothing. So, the Union enterprises which are in the capital are not subordinate to the Moscow Soviet. And you won't earn much on what local industry enterprises produce.

[Correspondent] The question comes to mind: how competent and far-sighted are the decisions being adopted by the Moscow Soviet now?

[Bryachikhin] By their own declaration and political orientation, these decisions are really progressive. But the weakest spot in the Moscow Soviet's work, and as a deputy I am also answerable for it, is the realization of ideas. Who will do this and when, and who will be responsible for it? Those are very fundamental questions.

[Correspondent] But there certainly are experienced workers in the Moscow Soviet Ispolkom, as far as I know.

[Bryachikhin] Then explain to me: what should the Moscow Soviet be responsible for? Yes, it is seeking new approaches and unusual solutions, but certainly those who propose something should be responsible for realizing their own solutions.

[Correspondent] And how do you feel about the recent decision of the Moscow Soviet which says that people working in administrative organs cannot be in political parties?

[Bryachikhin] In principle this decision is the right one. But when several parties exist. Still, in practice only one party exists, and this decision is taken to mean a ban on a profession. It turns out that if you are a communist, then you do not have the right to work in the courts or in the militsia.

[Correspondent] Berufsverbot [restriction of vocation]. Like the FRG had at one time?

[Bryachikhin] Yes. And that, I think, is illegal. Because it goes against our Constitution.

[Correspondent] What can you say about the work of the 28th CPSU Congress?

[Bryachikhin] The most distressing thing is that quite a considerable number of delegates do not at all understand that today the party is no longer what it used to be. That in the near future in itself the party will be just like any other social organization. And it must prove that it is the right one not just because it is the main one for distributing nails and removing directors. Power today is moving to the soviets. They are making management, economic, and political decisions. They may allow parties to locate on their territories and they may not.

[Correspondent] You don't see discrimination against the CPSU here?

[Bryachikhin] No. Although there may be some attempts in that regard. We are simply getting what we deserve. We can only be offended at ourselves.

[Correspondent] What about combining posts? What does your personal experience suggest?

[Bryachikhin] If you take your job in the party and in the soviets seriously, then it is simply impossible to combine these two matters.

Estonian Presidium Decree on Talks with RSFSR
90UN2514B Tallinn SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA
in Russian 20 Jul 90 p 1

[“Decree of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Estonian Republic: On Negotiations Between the Estonian Republic and the Russian Soviet Socialist Republic”]

[Text] Taking into consideration the information of the Government of the Estonian Republic on negotiations

with the RSFSR, the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Estonian Republic decrees the following:

1. To begin preparing for negotiations on organizing political and economic relations with the RSFSR.

2. To grant powers to the chairman of the Commission on the Economy of the Supreme Soviet of the Estonian Republic, A. Veetousme, and the minister of the economy of the Estonian Republic, J. Leimann, to prepare for and organize negotiations.

A. Ruutel, chairman,
Supreme Soviet of the Estonian Republic.
Tallinn, 17 July 1990.

Tallinn-Kiev Direct Ties Discussed

90UN2514C Tallinn SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA
in Russian 20 Jul 90 p 1

[Report by L. Rannamets: "Direct Ties With Kiev"]

[Text] A small delegation under the leadership of people's deputy of the USSR and deputy mayor of Tallinn, Irina Raud, has returned from the capital of the Ukraine. As per the instructions of the Government of the Estonian Republic and the mayor of Tallinn, our republic's envoys went to set up direct ties with Kiev.

Estonia's proposal to develop mutually beneficial cooperation was received with great interest, says Irina Raud. The chairman of the Kiev City Soviet, Arnold Nazarchuk, and his deputy, Aleksandr Mosyuk, suggested a number of spheres for cooperation. We met with the leaders of commissions and subcommissions of the Kiev City Soviet, with a deputy of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet, and with the leader of the "Democratic Platform," Valentin Oleynik.

Narva Komsomol Protests Draft Citizenship Law

90UN2514D Tallinn MOLODEZH ESTONII
in Russian 20 Jul 90 p 1

[“Appeal to the Committee of Estonia”]

[Text] As a sociopolitical organization orienting its activity to protecting the rights and interests of youth, the Narva Komsomol considers expressing its opinion regarding the draft of the Provisional Law on Citizenship published on 6 July 1990 in the newspaper MOLODEZH ESTONII as its duty. In appealing to the Committee of Estonia, we understand that we cannot express the opinion of all young people, just as the Committee of Estonia does not express the position of the entire Estonian people.

Attempts to roll back democratic processes in the Estonian Republic, which is undergoing a rebirth, disturb us. In our opinion, these projects cancel out the efforts of reasonable forces in the republic to enlist Russian-speaking Estonian residents to the side of those who are fighting to restore the state independence of Estonia.

Moreover, without providing any guarantees for the future, they help aggravate the situation in the republic to an even greater degree.

According to the draft of the Provisional Law, practically no young Narva citizen or his children living in their homeland for the second or third generation will receive Estonian citizenship without being naturalized. The authors of the Law "do not want the consequences of the occupation to take root," (the authors of the appeal emphasized this) and so they propose that a 50-year residence requirement be instituted in order "to guarantee the rights of the indigenous population."

It is in our interests to emphasize the political and economic independence of Estonia. But even so, we want to be equal masters of the land which for some of us is our homeland and for others, a second homeland.

We assume that in its present form the draft plays into the hands of the conservative forces in the republic, pushing young people who are loyally inclined toward the restoration of sovereignty into the ranks of the Intermovement and other organizations of that ilk.

Politics without circumspection can lead only to social conflict. We believe that all people residing permanently in the Estonian Republic when the Supreme Soviet adopted the Law should have the opportunity to receive citizenship.

The prosperity of some must not be built on the humiliation of others.

Adopted at the bureau of the Narva City Committee of the Leninist Young Communist League of Estonia, 12 July 1990.

Estonian CP Veterans Support Independence

90UN2514E Tallinn SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA
in Russian 21 Jul 90 p 1

[“Appeal of Estonian CP Veterans to the Estonian CP Central Committee”]

[Text] 22 July will mark a half century since the July events of 1940. Just a few years ago, this day was celebrated very solemnly: song holidays were dedicated to it and all kinds of events were held.

Some Estonian residents even now are trying to celebrate 21 July in the former spirit. For the most part their appraisal is based not on personal experience but on book wisdom, and it is especially clear now that that wisdom does not match historical truth. Behind this, of course, are political interests. These people are wrongly seeking support for their existence in the myths and falsifications of Stalinist times, without noticing that in that way they are again trying to build their future on lies and illegitimacy.

The truth is the only thing on which something firm can be built. It is also true that 21 July was only the continuation of a tragedy that began decades earlier, and in the interests of all peoples who live here we must recognize this fact and rely on the truth of our future.

For our veterans the events of June-July 1940 also have a personal side. A great deal of what seems indisputable in hindsight was by no means clear back then. Many of us supported the new way, sincerely believing in the speeches and intentions. Stalin managed to deceive people who were even more intelligent than we Estonian communists. Many of us passed through the camps and were repressed.

Perhaps what we were aspiring toward is now becoming a reality for the first time. But from the heights of our life experience and, perhaps, as a result of the scepticism we have accumulated during the years of our lives, even now we see the signs which put us on guard; still we stand by what is happening in Estonia with all our hearts. As members of the Estonian Communist Party bearing responsibility for what happened in Estonia over the half century, we wholeheartedly support the independence of Estonia and the creation of a new economic and democratic political system capable of development.

As veterans of the Estonian Communist Party, we see the present Estonian Communist Party as a democratic party of the future independent Estonia which could realize our plans to create a democratic society. We wish the party's present leadership and the new generation of communists success, the ability to reason properly, and determination in realizing what has been started.

[Signed by] Veterans of the party and participants in the meeting in the Estonian CP Central Committee

Estonian Minister Comments on 'Canada' Emigration Group

*90UN2514F Tallinn MOLODEZH ESTONII
in Russian 20 Jul 90 p 1*

[Interview with Artur Ivanovich Kuznetsov, minister of the Government of the Estonian Republic, by L. Glushkovskaya; time, place, and date not specified]

[Text] [Glushkovskaya] Artur Ivanovich, after our newspaper on 17 July published the announcement that the "Canada" emigration group was holding a sign-up in Tartu of all those who wanted to leave to Canada, readers began to write us. They would like to know, above all, what kind of a public organization this is, whether the government supports it, and so on. Do you know what is going on?

[Kuznetsov] Yes, I know. And I want to say right off that it can be called a strictly Tartu matter. The report on the creation of an emigration committee or a group appeared in the newspaper VPERED on 27 July. It was then that the sign-up of people wishing to emigrate to Canada began. For the most part that is also a Tartu

group. By mid-July approximately 340 people were on the lists, and most of them were Russians and Ukrainians, but there were Estonians, and Jews, and Latvians, and Lithuanians as well. I repeat, everything occurred without sanction on our part, no one told us about it.

[Glushkovskaya] How do you feel about this organization's activity?

[Kuznetsov] The most active representatives of this group, Viktor Tarabanko and Aleksandr Korobov, came from Tartu to see me, and I received more detailed information from them. The activists intend to set up and officially register a public committee on emigration to Canada. They submitted the documents, and the government must review them.

[Glushkovskaya] What will the decision depend on? What is your position?

[Kuznetsov] As you understand, Canada, where our people intend to go for permanent residence, has the deciding word, rather than us. I met with consul Jill Durocher at the Canadian Embassy. The consul stated the Canadian government's position on this issue. Today the Soviet Union is among those countries whose immigrants Canada usually accepts in only two cases. First, when the people coming are close relatives (father, mother, or spouse) or children up to 21 years of age, relatives of the so-called first circle. Second, relatives of the second circle—grandchildren, great-grandchildren, grandmothers and grandfathers, aunts and uncles, and others. In both cases someone in Canada has to promise to support the emigrants materially if they do not find work. It is altogether possible that in connection with the democratic changes which are happening in our state, the regulations for leaving our country to go to Canada will also be revised. But we must bear in mind that even then the selection will be made on an individual basis. There can be no talk of any mass emigration.

[Glushkovskaya] Then collective lists are not needed?

[Kuznetsov] These lists do not even show a person's specialization in all cases. But the Canadian side has very high criteria for selection in nine areas. A particular number of points must be accumulated. The basic criteria include age, knowledge of languages, popularity of the profession in Canada, length of work service, and many other things.

[Glushkovskaya] Since the requirements do not come from us, does that mean we cannot change them?

[Kuznetsov] We do not have the power, and besides, it would be improper to comment on them. And in general it is premature to discuss that, as long as we do not have the same status as other normal civilized states. For the time being, the two factors named above can be the only justification for leaving for Canada for permanent residence, and each case will be reviewed on a personal basis. That is why the announcement of the emigration

group confuses people, in my opinion, urges them to take an ill-considered step, and does them harm.

[Glushkovskaya] I do not think that anyone intends to persecute them in any way, right?

[Kuznetsov] Certainly not. It is simply that many of them will be in a state of suspension after leaving their work; their hopes will not be justified and disappointment will follow. It is a delicate issue, after all. The consul emphasized that many myths have been spread about Canada, and they are often unjustified. Canada is in no position to accept all those who wish to emigrate there. Without taking all these factors into account, the activists from Tartu say: we want all documents to be sent to Canada in September. But it usually takes a year or even more for them to be processed. In short, I would like to advise people to treat this idea with great responsibility.

[Glushkovskaya] Thank you, Artur Ivanovich, for the explanation.

Latvian CP Chiefs on Party Relations, CPSU Congress

90UN2503A Riga SOVETSKAYA MOLODEZH
in Russian 3 Jul 90 pp 1, 3

[Interviews with Alfrēds Rubiks, first secretary of the Latvian CP Central Committee, and Ivars Kezberis, chairman of the Independent Party of Latvia, by Svetlana Fesenko, SOVETSKAYA MOLODEZH correspondent; date and place not specified]

[Text] On the eve of the 28th CPSU Congress, the questions of the SOVETSKAYA MOLODEZH correspondent were answered by the leaders of two parties—the Latvian CP Central Committee first secretary, Alfrēds Rubiks, and the chairman of the Independent Communist Party of Latvia, Ivars Kezberis.

Alfrēds Rubiks: 'We Will Define the Platform After the Congress'

[Correspondent] Alfred Petrovich, what do you expect of the forthcoming CPSU Congress?

[Rubiks] Our society has been brought up in such a way that it always expects something unlikely from the next congress or plenum. I do not foresee anything unlikely. The basic documents have been published, they have been widely discussed, the founding congress of the RSFSR Communist Party has taken place—and in general the range of problems and final goals which can be attained at the congress have already been outlined.

But I expect the adoption of the Statute of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and—the main thing—how the Statute will define the status of the communist parties of the union republics. The discussion apropos of this has not yet been completed. There basically exist two points of view: Some want to see the communist parties of the union republics in the role of territorial

organizations of the CPSU, and others—as sufficiently independent organizations, which build their relations with the CPSU on its ideological and organizational unity. The second point of view is adhered to by the Latvian Communist Party, including by myself.

The discussions about a possible split, which will happen at the congress, seem unfounded to me. This did not happen at the founding congress of the RSFSR Communist Party (and the Russian Congress accounts for almost 60 percent of the delegates of the CPSU Congress), and I do not see forces that are sharply opposed to each other that would make it possible for the congress to delimit itself to the point of the departure of part of the delegates. Though this does not mean at all that complete harmony will reign. The already existing platforms will be brought out. The first—the communists who stand on the platform of the CPSU and adhere to the socialist orientation (although even among its supporters there is a sufficiently wide range of opinions). The second platform is the Marxist one, also of socialist choice, but very conservative, in my view. And the Democratic Platform, which is closer to socialist party than to a communist one.

Debates over the name of the party are possible. I think that it will remain the same as before. This is necessary not only in order to consolidate the progressive forces within the scales of the country, but this is necessary also for world public opinion, because people have become used to listen to our party, to reckon with it.

[Correspondent] What platform is closer to you personally?

[Rubiks] The platform of the CPSU. I support the socialist orientation with the acknowledgment of all the universal human values, which, in my view, have always been inherent in socialism. And this is the tragedy of socialism that those who undertook to realize it in life have distorted socialism to such an extent.

I do not believe that the entire party is guilty of those shortcomings, which existed and exist. One needs to talk about the guilt of the party leaders. Yes, and the system was such that it gave rise to such a type of leaders. About the system, there will also be a statement in the Statute: The elective and control organs in the party will be staffed in another way in order for there not to be the kind of corruption, the hardening, the possibility of having absolutely uncontrolled power, as have existed up to now.

[Correspondent] Your attitude to the creation of an independent Communist Party of Russia? How did you perceive its founding congress?

[Rubiks] This is very true. You see, at one time there was such a party. Then, already in the 1920's, the idea arose of the creation of a monolithic Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Hence there appeared also the violation of those inter-state relations, which should have been between the republics and the center, that is a unified

state party was created. Today such an idea has become obsolete. Russia, as all the other union republics, should have its serious status in the common family of our peoples. As a matter of fact, it is impossible to shift the blame for all the difficulties and deprivation on this large and rich republic, which is itself living in poverty. Russia has great potential, and now, having its own communist party within the composition of the CPSU, its own state formations, and Academy of Sciences, it will be able to realize this potential. And we, too, will have great advantages from our rich neighbor.

As other first secretaries of the central committees of the communist parties of the union republics, I was a guest of the Russian Congress and followed with great interest what was happening. I was impressed by the fact that all three platforms were given the possibility of come out with supplementary reports.

The congress was sufficiently united, somewhere, perhaps, conservative, there were few new, fresh ideas, there were more attempts to defend what had already been approved and had not always proved itself.

I am in agreement with the criticism addressed to the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee, lately the Politburo has not only not given its assessment with respect to a whole series of acute questions, but has been altogether silent. This concerns, for example, the split that has occurred in the communist parties of the Baltic republics. We have impatiently waited for a political assessment of what has happened by the Politburo. And, indeed, this would be of help to us.

It seems to me that the Politburo does not have sufficient desire, need, and perhaps ability to listen to the lower strata. But, you know, from the party organizations of the country information in the form of various resolution and letters literally comes there by the bagful. People, you know, write and hope that they will be listened to. But to say that all this will be taken into account in the development of the Program or the Statute is not enough. Great efficiency in the work and assessments is demanded of the Politburo.

But I do not agree with the pointless criticism aimed at Gorbachev. You know, he has taken upon himself—before the party, before the people, and before himself as a citizen, the most enormous responsibility for everything that is taking place. It is erroneous to regard the imperfections in the provinces and of Gorbachev's entourage as his own shortcomings.

Mikhail Sergeyevich is a man of democratic ideas and actions. At times he thinks even more democratically than would be necessary today in a number of cases. Somewhere more serious, more categorical actions are necessary to get things in order, already having hundreds of thousands of refugees, who have left the places where they have lived, hundreds of burnt homes, and hundreds of people killed. Then to put things in order is already too late.

But of this I again accuse not Gorbachev, but his entourage. After all, there are the Constitution, law enforcement organs, and the presidential ukase, and they are not implemented. Who should do this? Not members of the party, but the relevant organs.

[Correspondent] You have repeatedly rubbed shoulders with Gorbachev. What are your impressions about these meetings.

[Rubiks] It is very easy to rub shoulders with him. The idea never arises that before you is sitting the person who is preoccupied, whether he looks like a president or general secretary. He does not need to look like [a leader]—by his essence and by his actions, he personifies the leader. Discussions with him are held as an equal, he permits the expression of various point of view, one can debate with him. There is absolutely not the following: He came—receive instructions, now go and carry them out. He is greatly upset over those failures which our party is suffering, but he has a constructive program of actions, not a momentary one, but requiring time for realization. And I believe him, I believe him very much. Somehow, at one of the meetings, I even told him: "Mikhail Sergeyevich, I have come not to ask something of you, but to look into the eye and to receive a charge of courage." In response to which he smiled, and we had a very good discussion.

[Correspondent] Alfred Petrovich, how are you building your relations with the Independent Communist Party of Latvia?

[Rubiks] At first, we rubbed shoulders on the subject of the division of party property. Now a corresponding document has been signed—about the lease of premises and motor transport. So that, I believe, the question is exhausted.

It must be understood that this party will not be a communist party at all, but it retained the name only in order to fight for the property, to win over part of the communists. Of course, it is now experiencing a difficult stage of formation and organization, for this reason it sometimes permits various sorts of populist actions, including with respect to our party.

Yes, we have different goals, and in this sense there cannot be any cooperation. But there are questions in whose solution we could cooperate. For example: Ecology; the development of the kind of principles of actions of any parties and organizations which would not inflame national dissension; and agrarian problems. That is, we are talking about general human values. With respect to the village, we once attempted to organize a meeting, but the independents virtually ruined it.

[Correspondent] How do you assess the forces of your party?

[Rubiks] At present, there are two real forces that operate in the political arena of the republic—these are

the Popular Front (and all those under its roof) and the Communist Party of Latvia.

But the issue is something else—how many people are supporting us openly. Many do not express direct agreement with us, with our program, because today there exists in the republic the moral terror of suppressing any idea that runs counter to the policy of the Popular Front.

Our party organizations have been preserved most fully in Riga, Yelgava, and to the east of Riga, with the exception of Limbaži, Valmiyera, and Valka. How many of us have remained? In the rayon committees of our party, there remain today 162,000 registration cards. There had been 177,000. About 30,000 of the mentioned 162,000 were not taken off the register and did not leave the party, but they do not take part in party work and do not pay dues. Many of them, evidently, are awaiting the results of the 28th CPSU Congress. Why, we regard this with understanding. We believe that those who remain will become real kindred spirits.

[Correspondent] What precisely is your party called?

[Rubiks] We are not a party on the platform of the CPSU, although such a determination is frequently encountered. At the second Central Committee Plenum we defined ourselves as follows: The Communist Party of Latvia, which builds its work on the organizational and ideological unity with the CPSU. Our platform will be announced at the concluding session of the 25th Party Congress, which will take place after the 28th CPSU Congress.

But they call us all kinds of things. In addition to what I said above, they define us as a territorial organization of the CPSU. Well and, finally, when there is already nothing else to say, they say "the party of Rubiks." Because they count on the fact that, if Rubiks is a nasty man, that means the entire party is also nasty. This has been inspired already several years in succession, without any attempts to get into the soul of Rubiks, to hear him out, to look at him in action. Even if to set themselves the task: Why do so many people follow him? You see, they elected Rubiks on his first attempt to USSR people's deputy, Latvian SSR people's deputy, and to the city soviet. If, indeed, he were such a nasty man, then, most likely, he would not get through, and you know that there always were alternatives—three, four, and five people....

[Correspondent] Alfred Petrovich, how do you see your party in the conditions of an independent Latvia?

[Rubiks] My small commentary to the understanding of independence. We have repeatedly underscored in our political declarations that we advocate an independent Soviet Latvia within the composition of the USSR. Why exactly within the composition, and not outside? This is determined by economic, social, military, and other aspects. We see our task in showing the destructiveness and anti-popular character of the policy of the withdrawal from the composition of the USSR at this stage.

Our task is to show the inconsistency of the program of those organizations, including political parties that speak from positions of national limitation and the praise of nations over the human rights. We have human rights in first place, and the rights of nation—for the attainment and the guarantee of these rights.

But our party will be! Even if after the adoption of certain laws it will be declared to be outside the law. (Such a perspective exists. Laws are being prepared stipulating that the party must not have a "foreign leadership", which the CPSU is.) Be that as it may, about 120,000 people will believe our party, will believe in the socialist choice. And we will stand for this choice and express the interests of that part of the people which adheres to such views. And there are many such people. For this reason, I believe, our opponents are afraid of holding a referendum. If such a referendum is held and shows that the people considers it necessary to withdraw from membership in the USSR and to restore capitalist bourgeois usages, why then this is another matter. Then our party, after the holding of the referendum and the completion of the procedure for withdrawal from the Soviet Union by constitutional means, will decide what is to be done or remain and work here in the underground, or liquidate the party, or operate on the territory of the USSR.

[Correspondent] In our editorial mail, there are many letters with the question: What is being done in the building of the Central Committee? The apparatus, you know, has been reduced.

[Rubiks] Yes, we have substantially reduced the apparatus. The following are presently located here: The Central Committee, the Riga Party Gorkom, the editorial board of the journal KOMMUNIST SOVETSKOY LATVII, and the information center of the republic. In the future, we will accept still other organizations, since it is disadvantageous for us to lease a number of premises in the city, we will give up part of our accommodations in this building and we will pay for it fully.

[Correspondent] An aggravated situation has taken place in connection with the creation of a unified editorial council of the newspapers TsINYA and SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA....

[Rubiks] I think that this acuteness has been removed. But the decision of the plenum has not been implemented, that is for the time being we still find ourselves in the situation of the creation of a unified editorial board, and, of course, TsINYA will be our organ, whether people like this or not. We will operate in accordance with the procedure established by law. A person can be dismissed and get fixed up in a job in the editorial board, where his views coincide with what he writes.

[Correspondent] Will you speak at the 28th CPSU Congress?

[Rubiks] Undoubtedly. I have three variants of a speech, all of them are autonomous, although a number of things there have something in common. And every variant is not the last, because the speech will be prepared until the last day. Let us see, how things will go at the congress....

Ivars Kezbers: 'Our Presence Would Not Be Useless'

[Correspondent] In the issue of our newspaper for 23 June an interview with you was published, for this reason, Ivars Yanovich, I will ask you only a few questions. Thus, did you, nevertheless, receive an invitation to the 28th CPSU Congress?

[Kezbers] No. And it is a pity. If we had been invited, we would have been sure to come, even if as observers: Our presence at it would hardly have been useless. But they do not, as it were, take notice of us....

[Correspondent] A naive question: Why, does Gorbachev not know of your existence?

[Kezbers] Of course, he knows. But Gorbachev does not decide everything alone.

[Correspondent] How do you regard the creation of the Communist Party of the RSFSR?

[Kezbers] Very positively. In the conditions of the totalitarian regime, Russia, perhaps, had more to bear than the other republics. With all its enormous territory and natural resources, it was done out of its fair share of attention on the part of the center, [and] a mass of problems accumulated here. I think that the creation of an independent communist party will make it possible to face their solution.

Besides, I believe, that the CPSU can survive only if, instead of a ministry for personnel and ideology, which in essence it was until now, it will become a union of equal independent republic communist parties.

[Correspondent] The founding congress of the Communist Party of the RSFSR left an equivocal impression about itself....

[Kezbers] Yes, there were many emotions there. Perhaps, because it was prepared only as a party conference, with the preparatory work for it going on for 1.5-2 months prior to its being held. A certain part of the Russian fundamentalists defended the values of the day before yesterday—no, not perestroyka values, and those whose failure had already been fully demonstrated by life.

[Correspondent] Whom do you regard as belonging among such fundamentalists?

[Kezbers] The same Polozkov, in particular.

[Correspondent] How are you building your relations with the Communist Party of Latvia today?

[Kezbers] This is a difficult question. When the split occurred, we agreed on two things: Not to create one

from the other the image of an enemy and to bear responsibility for our respective political appeals and actions.

But for the time being there is not yet effective cooperation between us. The Communist Party of Latvia on the platform of the CPSU does not recognize the new government of the republic and a number of its legislative acts; in the composition of the recently formed government, half are representatives of our Independent Communist Party. We cannot agree even concerning the division of party property, in this respect the Central Committee of the Latvian Communist Party on the platform of the CPSU does not take into account the opinion of the communists of our party.

But we do have something to work on jointly. In 15 rayons of the republic, communists on the platform of the CPSU do not have any influence. At the same time, in Riga, Kraslava, and Daugavpils their positions are strong. Not to create a confrontation, but to strive for a quiet and businesslike dialogue—such, in my view, is the task of the communists standing for both positions.

[Correspondent] You know, Ivars Yanovich, in the search for your coordinates I called colleagues from BALTIYSKOYE VREMYA. After a short conference, they answered me at that end of the telephone wire: "With liberal communists, we are not going along...."

[Kezbers] "A pity, a pity," he jokes. Exactly with the present leadership of the Popular Front we have developed normal relations, its membership today includes enough people who weigh the pros and cons and think constructively. So that we regard the opinion of your colleagues from BALTIYSKOYE VREMYA as private opinions.

[Correspondent] Let us return to the forthcoming party congress. What is your prognosis?

[Kezbers] I am an optimist, and I believe that the congress will give a powerful impulse to the public life of the country. Even if the tone will be set by the conservatives (and that is how it will most likely be: Judging by the composition of the delegates and the atmosphere of the founding congress of the Communist Party of Russia), the democrats, too, will not lose: This will compel them to become more active and unite their efforts.

Role of Latvia's Citizens Congress Scored

90UN2504A Riga SOVETSKAYA MOLODEZH
in Russian 4 Jul 90 pp 1, 3

[Article by Historian Leonid Fedoseyev: "'Superhawks...Let Us Wait and See; or, 'What do Latvia and Lebanon Have in Common?'"]

[Text] Right now it is as if an already-familiar situation is repeating itself in the republic. Right after the formation of the NFL [Latvian People's Front], IF [Interfront],

its opposite, appeared; and now, since the formation of the Latvian Republic Citizens' Committees and Citizens' Congress, the process of forming committees for the defense of citizens of the USSR is gaining speed. Whereas the appearance of the NFL and IF were objectively almost inevitable, who or what brought about the formation of the second pair? One can do one's i's after answering several questions given in rhetorical form by the organizers of the Citizen's Congress themselves, but which have not yet really been answered.

Who organized the Citizens' Congress? The people? No, it was national-protectionist, ultraradical organizations and groups, among which DNNL no doubt played first fiddle. Identification of the Latvian people with national-protectionists like V. Latsia or A. Ingres is clearly erroneous, just as was the attempt to depict all non-Latvians as national-nihilists—unitarians like I. Lopatin or R. Dudnik, although both the former and the latter are trying to pass off their own ideas as the "voice of the people," and their actions—as the realization of the "demands of the workers." Both wings are actively promoting the creation of an image of the enemy—the nationalists are trying to convince the non-Latvian portion of the populace, that the "pearls" of V. Latsis express the secret thoughts of all Latvians; and the national-protectionists, quoting the "selected positions" are trying to create an impression of a menacing group of treacherous immigrants surrounding the Latvians. Tensions provide a medium of growth for both extremes—thereby they justify their own existence, and also with the help of the pressure of fear and disinformation they are creating a popular base for themselves. The collapse of tensions, and stabilization of society would spell death for the "superhawk" movement, therefore a "show" like the Citizens' Committee and Citizens' Congress are just what they need.

For whom was the Citizens' Congress created? Not one of the organizers was able to provide an intelligible answer to this question. And that is understandable; the congress (as a social organization) is in essence merely a more primitive and less capable version of the NFL. Then why create the committees or convene a congress? From the point of view of defending the people's interest there is no sense in it; but from the point of view of organizing a struggle prior to elections to the republic Supreme Soviet, it has completely justified itself. People, you see, of late have become accustomed to the escapades of the "ultras," and no longer notice them. It was necessary to organize something that would permit the "hawks" to once again turn up at the center of attention and entice the votes of the electors to their side.

The idea of citizenship has been intensively debated for two years already, and it is an urgent matter; thus the "ultras" have seized upon it. One can only congratulate them with the success of their tactics in the political struggle—the national-protectionists received nearly 20 percent of the seats (whereas the "pure" members of the DNNL [Latvian National Independence Movement] received nearly 10 percent). An excellent result, bearing

in mind their small numbers and paucity of positive ideas (Instead of well-founded positive programs for the future, on the whole they offer daydreams of the "splendid past").

But even the maximal result at the parliamentary elections did not satisfy the ultraradicals, and after the election they tended more and more in the direction of turning the Citizens' Congress into an alternative parliament (which testifies to their lack of sense of reality and political ethics). No one wishes to dispute the right of people who esteem the traditions of Latvia prior to 1940 to create their own socio-political organization. However, the Citizens' Congress does not intend to limit itself to the bounds of a social organization, and is putting forth claims to succeed to power.

What can the Citizens' Congress give to the republic? Positively, nothing; on the other hand, a great deal that is negative. Whenever ultraradicals have prevailed in politics, they have led society to instability, and finally—to coercion. I will briefly cite two crystal-clear examples: In Iran, after overthrowing the tyrant-Shah, the radicals gained the victory after monopolizing power. Under the slogan of a "people's revolution" a regime even more cruel toward dissidents was created, and the people continue to suffer. A second example—Lebanon, where several groups of radicals are trying to claw their way to power, and have turned the country into an open wound that will not heal.

Latvia is tending toward the Lebanese variant (although many aspire to be "ayatollahs"). This is promoted by the fact that the Citizens' Congress in fact gives the impression that the Supreme Soviet that was elected by the entire nation is only a fiction, and is obliged if not to directly subordinate itself, then as a minimum to share power with the congress. Openly ignoring the republic's parliament and disputing its authority will lead to destabilization of the situation in the republic—and to the creation of alternative power structures. The infectious example of the Citizens' Congress is beginning to spread further: for example, the leadership of the KPL [Latvian CP] (CPSU), taking advantage of the fact that the CPSU General Secretary and the President of the USSR are one person, are trying to create a kind of alternative leadership in the republic, based on the power of the USSR and the support of the CPSU. Committees for the defense of citizens of the USSR are being created (In principle, this is an inverted reflection of the Citizens' Congress of the LR [Latvian Republic]). Undermining the authority of the parliament leads to the fact that certain leaders in the localities will begin to ignore its decisions. Various organizations outside government control will create their own detachments for maintaining "order" and "stabilization" of the situation... And that is just what began in Lebanon. A person who thinks just a little bit understands, that popular rule and democracy are incompatible with uncontrolled "fist-law," which leads to a situation of "slugging it out nose-to-nose." It is relatively easy to draw people into conflict; but to extricate oneself is hard.

Is the creation of the Citizens' Congress legally beyond reproach, as its leaders declare? They criticize the elections to the Supreme Soviet because military servicemen and immigrants took part in the elections, and the elections themselves were held on the basis of the illegal Constitution of the Latvian SSR. But how do the organizers of the Citizens' Congress themselves observe the legalities on the basis of the 1922 Constitution? The Constitution was violated in the **grossest** manner. For example, the Constitution gives the right to vote from age 21, but 16-year-old voters took part in the election of delegates to the Citizens' Congress (reducing the age qualification by a whole five years!). Of course, getting the votes of emotional, politically-inexperienced adolescents, using shameless slogans, is far easier than engaging in well-argued propaganda among the more mature part of the populace. The status of "candidate" was introduced willfully; moreover, the organizers of the congress were many times found guilty of voluntaristic decisions on who may be a "citizen," and who a "candidate." But then, to establish popular participation in the citizens' committees one could easily register not only oneself, but also all one's relatives (all one has to know is questionnaire information). Therefore it is also hard to verify the results of the election, which were held with practically no supervision. Whereas at the elections to the republic parliament, the course of the elections were monitored by both officials and representatives of all interested parties, the elections to the Citizens' Congress took place in a "family circle."

The author of the given article, it would seem, does not have the right to question the respectability of the organizers of the Citizens' Congress; but the very behavior of the organizers does not inspire faith. For example, in 1989, when the question turned to the impropriety of setting up parallel state structures, and on a possible ban on the activities of the citizens' committees, the committees' creators all but took an oath that they were merely conducting sociological research, and had no political pretensions of any kind. As it turns out this was a lie, and soon after the convocation of the Citizens' Congress (and at the Congress too), those same leaders very categorically demanded that they be placed at the same level with the republic parliament. Such behavior hardly testifies to a firm moral foundation and does not extend to blind faith.

Faith in the democratic nature and political purity of both the national-protectionists and the national-nihilists is completely destroyed when it becomes clear to which "idols" both directions bow. The greatest autocrat of Latvia serves as the example to the first "democrats," and to the second, "the Greatest Leader of the Nations" of the USSR. It is, of course, difficult to compare them, but both of them was the greatest usurper and strangler of democracy in his country.

If the article provided more details of the LR Citizens' Congress and not of the "saviors" of the non-Latvian part of the populace, it was not because the latter were better. This movement is in essence equally dangerous

for our entire society. It is simply that the first at the present time has been more clearly formulated; moreover, for the non-Latvian reader it is easier to take a critical approach to a problem that is for him more alien, that of the LR Citizens' Congress, in order to then thoroughly and more soberly analyze what is in fact an identical extreme, in which they are trying to drive him himself.

To criticize a Latvian-speaking Russian organization or a Russian-speaking Latvian organization in Latvia is extremely risky: instead of a constructive answer, one gets a critique of the personality of the "chronic complainer," and the "discussion" concludes by rolling up the problem in terms of "who can play the most dirty tricks on the other," or else they begin to "color-in the blank spaces" of the story by far-from-scientific methods. Thus, it is better that the people themselves deal with their "hawks."

The Russians themselves cope extremely well with the national-nihilists, who have cast themselves in the role of defenders of the Russians—and who have in practice shown that the ideas ascribed to "Baltic nationalists and separatists" are close to those of the citizens of Russia, and that the ideas of "internationalists" are not acceptable—not only to the Baltic but also to the Slavic peoples. The results of the struggle with national-protectionists and national-nihilists in Latvia itself are much more modest: the Latvian parliament (confidence in which the "hawks" are undermining) and the NFL, which have assumed the role of the leader of the forces of democratization in the republic, are hesitant to take steps to separate themselves from extremism, and to oppose all the destabilizing forces in the republic.

Stability could be fostered if the parliament were to adopt a democratic and tactful law on citizenship. There will no doubt be a law on citizenship, but whether it is truly democratic—of this there is no assurance. Individually the national-protectionists and the national-nihilists in parliament are not strong enough, but together they are altogether capable of killing the law, which they are not interested in adopting. And stabilization is more than disadvantageous to both of them.

Of course, many people viewed the lines about the possible "Lebanonization" of Latvia with irony. Once again, the old habit, "If the thunder doesn't sound, the peasant doesn't cross himself" is operating. But who would have believed, when perestroyka started, that in a couple of years there would be distribution of ration cards and galloping inflation; that the army would wield spades against its fellow-citizens and would assault a legally-constituted parliament; or that there would be a mass strike by miners, and a schism among communists? And now once again, shall we wait...and see?

Latvian 'Campaign' To Rename Places, Remove Lenin Statues Scored

*90UN2510A Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA
in Russian 20 Jul 90 p 2*

[Article by V. Proskura: "Just Look at the 'Place-names'"]

[Text] "Along with other methods of political offensive, on the eve of the 50th anniversary of the restoration of Soviet rule, the new ruling bloc in the republic is also making a practice of the following... They are renaming the streets of the cities; they are changing the names of rayons; they are pulling down monuments which are dear to internationalist workers; and they are 'recopying' museum expositions. Propagandists from the government camp affirm: they say the placenames are being restructured, and the memorial markers are being brought into accord with the socio-political situation. The new authorities are hastening to remove from the popular consciousness the memories of the socialist option, and are attempting to cause to be forgotten the achievements which the workers made owing to Latvia's entry into the USSR; and they want to deprive the people of their progressive historical memory." (A report from the Republic Committee for the Defense of the Rights of the Citizens, the USSR Constitution, and the Latvian SSR.)

A bit earlier Latvian Internal Affairs Minister J. Jurkans had made the following statement for foreign correspondents: "We have no conflict between Latvians and non-Latvians; but there is a conflict between the people who wish to live in a democratic country, and those who do not want to lose their privileges." Shortly after the press conference, the heads of the diplomatic department—those who, using Jurkans' expression, did not want to lose their privileges, namely the employees of the republic Council of Ministries (the overwhelming majority of whom were former apparatchiks)—when they came to work in the morning, did not see the bust of Lenin in their vestibule. It had been taken away quietly under cover of darkness. This gave the opposition from the Latvian SSR United Trade Union Council occasion to cast aspersions on the new administration: they took it away, they say, so they would not be embarrassed to walk by it.

Perhaps to a casual observer such a phrase would appear to be merely a barbed polemical device. But some people believe, and not without reason, that the one responsible for the memorial perestroyka in the government vestibule was, at least by virtue of his office, Minister for Affairs of State K. Licijs (Previously his position was called simply, the Council of Ministers' Administrator of Affairs). Still earlier Karlis Arturovich had occupied the extremely responsible position of party gorkom first secretary in the resort center of Yurmala. He is known as a splendid Komsomol worker, a habitue of presidiums and measures conducted ordinarily by a "narrow circle."

When, through the efforts of the People's Front parliamentary faction Licijs was confirmed in the Supreme

Soviet as chief of the chancellery under the new premier, "political commissar of NFL [Latvian People's Front]" I. Godmanis, the deputies asked him his attitude toward his own party. Karlis Arturovich was quick to affirm that he had left it the night before... Several days later the constituent assembly was held, at which OSTK [United Council of Labor Collectives], the International Workers' Front, and the Communist Party had set up the Committee for the Defense of the Rights of the Citizens, the USSR Constitution and the Latvian SSR. I especially remember how delegate F. Kats, a construction specialist, took the floor; Kats had been a Komsomol activist under Licijs, "only from different sides of the presidium," and nervously read the "poem he composed himself," dedicated to the political revolutionaries [pervertysham]. "It was painful to hear the line, "No one has faith in the old idols—they have sold out their own mothers."

I quote it because the perestroyka in placenames and the dismantling of the monuments of Soviet Latvia was accompanied by a noisy demagogic campaign in many of the mass information media, which fomented mass hysteria under the slogan, "Penitence for the Past." But who should confess before whom? Is A. Aleksejevs, the leader of the workers' Interfront, and also a construction engineer, really more to blame for the present disorder in socio-economic life than, shall we say, J. Oherins, a member of the NFL cabinet, Minister of Industry, and former republic Communist Party Central Committee Secretary for Socio-Economic Questions?

I unexpectedly found a "like-thinker" on this account in the person of the chairman of the board of the NFL Duma, R. Razuks. In his report to the Baltic Assembly of People's Fronts he noted: "Undoubtedly, many honest people had joined the Communist Party. At the very same time, there were among the communists quite a number of people for whom the party was a stepping-stone for their career; and they...are trying with all their might to hold onto their easy chairs... These people have entered our government." What of it? It is within the political kitchen that the springs of the social mechanism can best be seen.

The so-called "Preyli Story" also became a kind of confirmation of the observations of R. Razuks. The public in this area appealed in an open letter to Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet Chairman A. Gorbunovs on the eve of the 50th anniversary of the restoration of Soviet rule. It seems only recently that Anatolijs Valeryanovich, in his capacity as republic Communist Party Central Committee Secretary for Ideology, as he unveiled the monument to V.I. Lenin in Preyli, uttered the sonorous words: "Lenin was for us and will continue to be a symbol of honor, wisdom and conscience. The ideas of the Leader shall illuminate our path in the quest for answers to unclear questions."

Today's question, on the whole, is clear: the functionaries of the NFL, without taking counsel with the citizens, passed a resolution in the local Soviet on the

removal of this monument, the splendid work of Latvian sculptor D. Janson. A large crowd, meeting in protest, kept them from carrying out this cowardly deed. But for how long? After all, there already are places on the map of the republic where such acts of vandalism were carried out in spite of the protests of the public. But Comrade [or in accordance with the current official terminology—Mister] Gorbunovs declined to openly answer this bitter question without any remorse at all.

The list of renamings grows longer with the approach of the days of celebration. In Riga, Yuri Gagarin St. was subjected to this procedure. Nor did the streets named after the progressive Latvian writer Andrey Upit and hero of the anti-fascist resistance Imant Sudmalis escape this demeaning fate. Sometimes such things border on the ridiculous. The largest factory region of Riga—Proletarskiy Rayon, the roots of which are in the center of the city (here the new building of the Artistic Academic Theater imeni Yan Raynis is situated not far from the famous BEF), will be called the Vidzemsky Suburbs. In short, things are being reshaped according to the old form, in accordance with the old placename.

NFL leader Dainis Ivans (now vice-chairman of the Supreme Soviet) has come to the political way of life from behind his desk as literary associate of the magazine SHKOLA I SEMYA, where he won popularity from his essays on education in the local lore. Did it really never occur to him that demonstratively destroying the people's monument and the restoration of the outmoded is, to put it mildly, a futile undertaking?

And the last bit of information. The NFL "majority faction" in the Riga city Soviet has managed to abolish services for invalids and veterans of the Great Patriotic War in specialized stores. Yes, one more "holiday present." You see, the majority of those who installed the new rule here in 1940, later became soldiers in the 130th Latvian Corps of the Soviet Army.

Under these conditions the republic Committee for Protection of Rights, together with the people's deputies-internationalists shall continue their campaign of public protest.

Latvian Front Scores Citizens Congress

*90UN2634A Riga SOVETSKAYA MOLODEZH
in Russian 28 Jul 90 p 2*

[Statement by the Board of the Duma of the Latvian People's Front: "On the Citizens Congress of the Latvian Republic"]

[Text] It is the considered opinion of the Board of the Duma of the Latvian People's Front that:

- In reestablishing the de facto independence of the Latvian Republic during the transition period, supreme legislative authority in Latvia is vested in and rightfully exercised by the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet exclusively. The Citizens Congress of the

Latvian Republic serves as no more than the legal representative of the citizens of the former Latvian Republic.

- The Citizens Congress of the Latvian Republic, in adopting the resolution "On Changes in the Basic Operating Principles of the Citizens Congress of the Latvian Republic" at its second session, created a situation that adversely affects the overall movement of democratic forces on behalf of the independence of Latvia.
- The resumption of the de facto independence of the Latvian Republic entails proper coordination between the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet, its permanent commissions, and the Citizens Congress of the Latvian Republic in drafting documents, decisions, and legislation of vital importance to the citizens of the Latvian Republic.

24 July 1990.

Decisions of Moldavian Supreme Soviet

*90UN2547A Kishinev SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA
in Russian 20 Jul 90 p 1*

[Decree of the Presidium of the Moldavian Supreme Soviet: "On the Legislative Activities of the Moldavian Supreme Soviet"]

[Text] In the aim of providing the necessary level of organization for further work to improve and develop republic legislation and to strengthen the rights of Moldavia, the Presidium of the Moldavian Supreme Soviet decrees:

1. To turn over to the permanent commissions of the Moldavian Supreme Soviet for a preliminary discussion the following Moldavian draft laws in the following order:

"On Moldavian Sovereignty" to the Commissions on the Questions of Law, on Questions of the Economy and Budget, for International Ties, on the Questions of Local Self-Administration and the Local Economy;

"On Citizenship in Moldavia" to the Commissions for Nationality Questions, for the Questions of Law, for the Questions of Glasnost and the Mass Information Media and on the Questions of the Economy and the Budget;

"On the Principles of the Socioeconomic Independence of Moldavia" to the Commissions on the Questions of the Economy and Budget, on International ties, on the Questions of Local Self-Administration and the Local Economy and on Science and Education;

"On Property in Moldavia" to the Commissions on the Questions of the Economy and Budget, Agrarian and the Questions of Social Development of the Countryside, on Questions of Local Self-Administration and the Local Economy and on the Questions of Law;

"The Moldavian Code on Land" to the Commissions for Agrarian and the Questions of Social Development of

the Countryside, for Questions of Ecology, for Questions of the Economy and Budget, for Questions of Local Self-Administration and Local Economy and for Questions of Law;

"On Leasing" to the Commissions on Questions of the Economy and Budget, on Questions of Local Self-Administration and Local Economy, Agrarian and Questions of Social Development of the Countryside and for Ecology Questions;

"On Employment of the Population in Moldavia" to the Commissions for Questions of Economy and Budget, Agrarian and for Questions of Social Development of the Countryside, for the Problems of Women, Protection of the Family, Maternity and Childhood, on Questions of Local Self-Administration and Local Economy, on the Questions of Law, for Public Health and Social Security;

"On Emigration and Immigration" to the Commissions for Questions of the Economy and Budget, Agrarian and for Questions of Social Development of the Countryside, for Questions of Local Self-Administration and Local Economy, for the Problems of Women, the Protection of the Family, Maternity and Childhood, and for Questions of Law;

"On Guarantees for the Rights of National Groups Residing in Moldavia" to the Commissions on Nationality Questions, for Questions of Culture and Sects and for Questions of Law;

"On the Referendum (Popular Voting) in Moldavia" to the Commissions on Questions of Law, on Questions of Glasnost and Mass Information Media, on Nationality Questions, on Questions of Local Self-Administration and Local Economy;

"On the Procedure for Recalling a Moldavian People's Deputy" to the Commission on Questions of Law;

"On the Procedure for Recalling a Deputy of a Local Moldavian Soviet" to the Commissions on the Questions of Law, Local Self-Administration and Local Economy;

"On Municipal Self-Administration" to the Commissions on Questions of Local Self-Administration and Local Economy, the Economy and Budget;

"On Rayon Self-Administration" to the Commissions on Questions of Local Self-Administration and Local Economy, the Economy and Budget, Agrarian and for Questions of Social Development of the Countryside;

"On City (Rayon-Subordination Cities), Settlement and Rural Self-Administration" to the Commissions on Questions of Local Self-Administration and Local Economy, the Economy and Budget, Agrarian and for Questions of Social Development of the Countryside.

The permanent commissions of the Moldavian Supreme Soviet in the necessary instances are to call in scientists

and specialists from various sectors of the national economy to participate in working out the draft laws.

A preliminary discussion of the draft laws is to be concluded prior to 1 September 1990. The conclusions on them are to be submitted to the Second Session of the Moldavian Supreme Soviet.

2. The permanent commissions of the Moldavian Supreme Soviet are to be instructed to organize by this date the elaboration of the following draft laws by the work groups: on the status of the Moldavian people's deputies, the mass information media in Moldavia, on power, on parties and other public formations in Moldavia.

3. The Moldavian government is to work out and present for review by the Second Session of the Moldavian Supreme Soviet draft laws in accord with the appendix.

4. The above-designated draft laws and the drafts of other enforceable enactments are to be submitted to the Presidium of the Moldavian Supreme Soviet by 1 December 1990.

M. Snegur, chairman,
Moldavian Supreme Soviet.
Kishinev, 2 July 1990.

Appendix to the Decree of the Presidium of the Moldavian Supreme Soviet of 2 July 1990

Draft Laws to be Worked Out.

1. On the state budget.
2. On exports and imports.
3. On financial and foreign exchange assets.
4. On republic banks.
5. On socioeconomic glasnost.
6. On local self-administration (city, rayon and rural soviet).
7. On entrepreneurship activities.
8. On the distribution of state and cooperative apartments.
9. On monetary circulation.
10. On statistics.
11. On intellectual property.
12. On pension support for citizens in Moldavia.
13. On tourism, representation of Moldavia in other states and other states in Moldavia.
14. On state institutions of learning and organizations (all levels).
15. On the training of national cadres for the republic economy, education and public health.

16. On culture.
17. On the protection of nature.
18. On saving material and primary resources.
19. On the protection and rational utilization of water.
20. On state reserves.
21. On sects.

Party Metes Out Punishment for Unlawful 'Chernobyl' Cruise

*90UN24964 Minsk SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA
in Russian 20 Jun 90 p 4*

[BELTA report: "Epilogue to a Cruise"]

[Text] The Belorussian Telegraph Agency has received a notice from the Party Control Commission of the Belorussian CP Central Committee, regarding implementation of the decree of the Belorussian CP Central Committee Bureau "On facts of serious violations and abuses in organizing cruise trips committed by the management of the 'Minsktrurist' association and the Belorussian Council on Tourism and Excursions, certain trade union committees and enterprises." This involves the cruise supposedly organized for victims of the Chernobyl catastrophe, about which so much has been written in the republic's press. And not only the republic's.

The decree of the Belorussian CP Central Committee Bureau, the notice states, has been reviewed in the bureaus of the Minsk and Gomel obkoms, the Minsk and Mogilev Party gorkoms, the presidium of the Belsovprof (Belorussian Council of Trade Unions), the plenum of the Minsk obsovprof (oblast council of trade unions), and in the primary Party and trade union organizations and labor collectives whose workers committed the violations or abuses in organizing the cruise.

By decision of the bureau of the Mogilev gorkom of the Belorussian Communist Party the general director of the "Mogilevturist" association, M.N. Yelin, and his deputy, A.P. Savin, have been expelled from the Party. The presidium of the obsovprof expressed its lack of confidence in them in accordance with current labor law.

The Minsk gorkom of the Belorussian Communist Party expelled the director of sport and cultural activities, V.G. Vasilev, from the CPSU.

Severe reprimands with an entry in their registration forms were pronounced against the head of the office for international work and Soviet tourism of the Gomel obsovprof, P.S. Lychkovskiy, the deputy chairman of the Belorussian Council for Tourism and Excursions, P.P. Sakovich, the chairman of the Minsk obkom of the trade union of commercial workers, A.I. Diochkovskiy, and the head of the foreign tourism office of the oblast tourist-excursion production association "Minsktrurist,"

V.Yu. Kashevskiy. Other Communists responsible for violations in organizing the cruise were called to Party account.

By decision of the presidium of the Belsovprof and the plenum of the Minsk oblast council of trade unions, the chairman of the republic council of tourism and excursions, Ye.F. Roslik, the general director of the "Minsktrurist" association, F.K. Solyanik, and his deputy, A.M. Kritchenkov, were relieved of their duties. Several other officials of this association were also punished.

By a decree of the Belorussian SSR procurator's office, a criminal investigation has been opened into the facts of violations in organizing the cruise, and a special investigative group has been formed. The Belorussian SSR Ministry of Finance and the Belsovprof are conducting an inspection of documents.

The plenum of the Minsk oblast council of trade unions, which has agreed with the evaluations and conclusions of the Belorussian CP Central Committee Bureau, has decided to leave the chairman and secretary of the oblast council of trade unions, A.P. Martysuk and R.A. Davydovich, in their previous positions. The same decision was taken by the presidium of the council of representatives of labor collectives of the NPO (scientific and industrial association) "Belmedpribor," a meeting of which decided the fate of the general director of the association, V.R. Vaaks. Subsequently, V.R. Vaaks was relieved of his duties as general director of the NPO "Belmedpribor" in connection with his election as director of the "Frebor" enterprise.

Lvov's Political Opposition Viewed

*90UN25054 Riga SOVETSKAYA MOLODEZH
in Russian 3 Jul 90 p 2*

[IMA Press article by Sergey Osipov: "Western Ukraine: The Yellow and Sky-Blue Versus the Red"]

[Text] A Yellow and Sky-Blue flag flies over the Lvov Oblast CPSU Committee building: the same flag which in the Ukraine is associated with "Samostiyost" [Ukrainian Separatist Movement], and in Russia with Simon Petlyura and the bloody events of 1918 in Kiev. A few years ago one could be put in prison for this flag, and just a year ago it would have invited a rubber truncheon. Meanwhile, at the end of April the newly-elected oblast Soviet authorities granted permission to utilize the national symbol along with the official one.

The new regime is headed by Vyacheslav Chornovil, a journalist, who was sent to prison three times for his political convictions. It was only in 1985 that he returned home from his last "visit." Convicted with him were his close comrades in the movement, Ivan Gel and Stepan Khmara; the Mikhaylo brothers and Bogdan Goryn; and the Kalinets', Irina and Igor—all of whom have also become People's Deputies. The names of these people, not one of whom has yet been rehabilitated, are

on the tongues of the entire city—Have you ever heard of such a thing, that such a representative group of criminals has come to power...

I arrived in Lvov shortly after their victory. My first impression was that the tension of recent months appeared to have quieted down. The political meetings have moved from the city square to the "first session of the Oblast Soviet, the first democratic convocation."

The hall in which the deputies meet was packed to the rafters. Broadcasting has long ago devoured the scant budget for Lvov Television; therefore, money was collected for this throughout the oblast. Behind the backs of the presidium was an enormous yellow and sky-blue panel with a portrait of Taras Shevchenko. Behind the panel, as if behind a closed theater curtain, stands a bust of Lenin, invisible to the world. The zigzags of local democracy...

"Down with partocracy and the procuracy! Shame on the CPSU and the KGB!"

"Long live the free Ukraine, Galitsia and the Lvovshchina!"

Ukrainian has become the official parliamentary language in Lvov. And the vigilant "gromadyane" [rural Ukrainian commune members] who came to support their delegates, are talking loudly under the windows: literally everyone in Lvov is interested in politics right now; but not those who were before. True, occasionally a well-known old-timer peers out from among the new members. Here to greet the session are sweet little children in hand-sewn Ukrainian shirts, saying "Christ is Risen," rather than "Best of Health to Leonid Illich," as it used to be ten years ago at party congresses.

With a burst of emotion, and the rapture of long-awaited power—all the orators mounted the rostrum, often repeating one another. Something like this happened last year at the First Congress of USSR People's Deputies. There is only one difference: in Moscow the positions of the reformers and the conservatives were clear-cut; but here there are no conservatives. None at all.

The Democratic Bloc of the Ukraine gained the victory in the elections in Lvov. The bloc consisted of "Rukh," the Popular Movement for Perestroyka; the party of the Ukrainian Helsinki Alliance; the Union of Independent Ukrainian Youth; the Ukrainian Language Society imeni Taras Shevchenko; the Committee for the Defense of the Ukrainian Greco-Catholic Church; the Ecological-Cultural Society of Lvov; the Student Fraternity; and others.

Prior to the elections the Dembloc spoke out from a united platform. It can be reduced to five points: All power to the Soviets; sovereignty for the Ukraine; and the battle for the economic, ecological and national-cultural rebirth of the republic. A certain number of things have already been done: basically Christian holidays have been declared days of rest, a resolution was

adopted on the creation of a national park, and the peasants' private subsidiary farms have been enlarged. But will they be able to maintain their unity in the future?

Questions on the economy and sovereignty cause the greatest amount of disagreement—everyone has his own opinion on them: from autonomy within the framework of the USSR, to immediate separation; from market socialism to capitalism and even to autarky. Deputies from Rukh, the Helsinki Alliance and the Lvov Society tend toward the center. Ultraradicals, many of whom even Rukh considers too conservative—who have all but "sold out to the Bolsheviks," do not amount to serious competition for them. The Ukrainian Popular-Democratic League (100 persons) openly declare to one and all their opposition to any kind of authority, except their own. The opposition is more likely to be the middle and upper echelons of leadership of the oblast party organization.

At the May Day demonstration, a single island of red—the party committee from one of the plants which came out for the holiday of international solidarity—was drowned in a sea of yellow and sky-blue flags. People avoided the Reds like the plague [sic]. The leader of Lvov's communists was not to be seen at the demonstration. Sharp tongues later said that he had been organizing an underground May Day meeting in Shevchenko Grove in the forest preserve. There is a grain of truth to this joke.

At almost the very time that Vyacheslav Chornovil was assuming his new post, placing his hand on the Bible and pronouncing the words of the oath, professional Communist Vyacheslav Sekretaryuk was accepting the oblast party leadership. He was replacing Yakov Pogrebnyak in this post; according to some accounts, Pogrebnyak had "capitulated before the extremists," but by others, he had opened a dialog with the national movement. Sekretaryuk began his rule with a 180-degree turnaround toward confrontation. Promising to oppose the new Soviet, he predicted a short life for it—six months.

The Soviets were not in debt. Levko Zakharchishin, the deputy from the Lvov Society declared that a policy of confrontation would provoke a mass exit from the party. True, he was speaking of this more from alarm than from malice: "If only the right radicals remain in the party, it will be a very dangerous party. In that case it is possible that it may be banned."

As a result, a state of diarchy has come to pass in the oblast: the points of contact between Soviet and party power have not yet been found; nor is anyone looking for them—although the two sides are afraid to aggravate the situation. The bounds of opposition can be seen everywhere. Two newspapers remained under the control of the CPSU, but MOLODA GALICHINA, the organ of the Komsomol obkom, has supported the Soviets. Rukh has spoken out for the Uniate Church, but the Communist Party has more sympathy with the Ukrainian

Orthodox Church. Working collectives are divided into Orthodox and Greco-Catholics. Even confirmed atheists considered it their duty to associate themselves with one or the other confession.

One can expect even more serious delineation on nationalist soil. Although one will find no overtly chauvinistic demands in one of the programs of the 20 Lvov parties and organizations, and although Rukh and the Russian Society imeni Andrey Sakharov acted in concert at the Mayday meeting, nationalism nevertheless exists, and not only at the everyday level.

In Ternopol, the center of the neighboring oblast, I observed a ceremony dedicated to the yellow and sky-blue flag. A procession with ecclesiastical banners and a church choir was making its way with difficulty through a crowd of thousands in Teatralnaya Square. Public prayers were said...for the victory of the Greco-Catholic standard over a certain anonymous "adversary" (The impression was such that the hordes of the usurpers were standing at the walls of Ternopol, and that tomorrow the decisive battle would take place). The enemy is not personified, but it is clear to everyone that it is not American imperialism...

A new kind of enemy? Alas, they were long ago created by the combined efforts of the Ukraine and Russia, and by the stubborn refusal to acknowledge historical reality.

The complaints of the Russian population against the new authorities today are not of a political nature, and can be reduced in principle to what a certain woman told me: "You know, under the previous Soviet rule, which at the same time was exceptionally bad, the streetcars nevertheless ran on time."

On the whole, it's as if the situation in Lvov has absorbed all the basic aspects of the social life of the country—the weakening of the Communist Party, the politicization of the populace, the aggravation of national and religious problems, and an earnest desire to correct the mistakes of the past... Just so we do not make new mistakes at the same time. Just so we will not have to have another perestroyka—to eliminate the consequences of the present one.

Deputies Deplore CP Congresses

90UN2506B Kiev PRAVDA UKRAYINY in Russian
6 Jul 90 p 4

[Statement by the people's deputies of the Ukrainian SSR, members of the CPSU, V. Meshcheryakov, V. Filenko, V. Moskovka, V. Grinev, V. Kushnarev and others; altogether 44 signatures on the statement: "After the Congress: The Democratic Platform's Position and the Comments Regarding It"]

[Text] A statement by the delegates of the 28th Congress of the CPSU and the 28th Congress of the Ukrainian Communist Party, by the people's deputies of the Ukrainian SSR—supporters of the "Democratic Platform" in

the Communist Party of Ukraine" concerning the first stage of the 28th Congress of the Ukrainian Communist Party's results.

We, the delegates of the 28th Congress of the CPSU and the 28th Congress of the Ukrainian Communist Party, members of the coordinating council of the "Democratic Platform in the Ukrainian Communist Party" and members of the deputy's group in the Higher Council of the Ukrainian SSR, the "Democratic Platform in the Ukrainian Communist Party," in evaluating the results of the first stage of the 28th Congress of the Ukrainian Communist Party, think, that the course of the congress and its resolutions have not met most of the Communists' expectations, have not reflected the democratic mood both in the Party and amidst the people, and have not planned any ways out of the worsening crisis. Instead of searching for pathways for the Party and society to get out of the crisis, the majority of the speeches reflected violent objection to the politics of renewal that was voiced by the initiators of perestroyka and attempts to discredit the supporters of the radical reforms of the Party.

The congress clearly showed the unwillingness to reform the Ukrainian Communist Party into a real, new, modern party of a democratic sort. The constructive proposals concerning a radical democratization of the Party, its integration into the democratization of society, in essence were blocked and rejected by the congress. The central organs of the Ukrainian Communist Party were formed by means of an apparatus and only "voted" through since there was no alternative.

In regards to the case in which there were more than a few isolated facts, when a list of candidates was introduced for nomination to the central party organs, candidates who were not nominated by the local party organizations, and from which candidates were arbitrarily "eliminated," we are insisting on conducting a public investigation of the process of how the list of candidates was made and of the make-up of the central party organs from the Kiev city and oblast organizations. We are proposing to the Politburo of the Central Committee of the Ukrainian Communist Party to form together with the representatives of the "Democratic Platform" a commission for investigating the voting procedure for nomination and selection of candidacies for the central organs, bidding it to complete the given job and to publish the results before the beginning of the second stage of the 28th Party Congress of the Ukrainian Communist Party. We are calling on all Communists of the republic, who are supporting real democratization of the Party, with the assistance of the aforesaid commission to conduct on the spot public investigations of the party's process of nominating and selecting candidates as members of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee and the CPSU Central Committee.

In our view, the first stage of the 28th Congress of the Ukrainian Communist Party has not reflected the true positions of the party organs, the Communists of the

republic, but rather the interests of the still intact administrative-command system, which has led the Party into a crisis, and the country—to the verge of a catastrophe. Clearly, the party apparatus that identifies itself with the entire Party is striving to unite all the conservatives to return to the time when the Party was the "leading and guiding force" and is preparing for the "decisive battle" with the progressive forces in the Party at the 28th Congress of the CPSU.

That is why today we see our main task as consolidating the delegates of the congress—representatives, like the "Democratic Platform," as well as other movements and groups that are supporting fundamental reforms of the Party and the irreversibility of the perestroika processes. We are calling on the delegates of the 28th Congress, all the Communists of the republic to defend the nascent democracy from the right-wing conservative forces, from those, who are pulling the Party and society back.

We are convinced that further delay of fundamental reforms of the Party threatens a full loss of its revolutionary potential and will leave it completely without any trust amidst the people.

Ukrainian Time Change Causes Problems

*90UN2506A Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA
in Russian 28 Jul 90 p 2*

[Article by O. Gusev, issued from Kiev: "A Boomerang: Move the Time Back!"]

[Text] In newspapers the residents of Ukraine learned that during the second half of the year the republic will

live and work according to Kiev time: the Higher Council of the Ukrainian SSR passed this resolution at a session without any considerable discussion with the community.

What has turned out in practice?

—We have already lost a minimum of two, twenty ton containers of writing paper for preparing orders; the time-tables for transportation need to be changed. Actually "Kiev time" has forced us to make changes in thousands of graphic captions to make them match documents which will permit the remaining unchanged movement of trains, planes, sea traffic, broadcasting to continue—states the Minister of Transportation of the Ukrainian SSR, P. Volkov. In this manner we will lose in the hundreds of thousands of rubles with no foreseeable end to losses in sight.

One can imagine how the new resolution was received by thousands of workers and employees, arriving to Kiev by Moscow's time-table by which the electric trains run—they are really losing time from their working day.

Just in the first three days of work following the new time standard, tardiness on a large scale in getting to work was noted in Crimea. That is why the Crimean Regional Executive Committee began the working day an hour earlier, not touching in this instance the clock hands, in order to not formally revise the parliament session's resolution.

The law has been passed. Is it in keeping with the times?

University of Peoples of North Discussed
*90UN2528A Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA
in Russian 31 Jul 90 p 2*

[Article by S. Gorokhov, department head of Yakutsk University, member of the presidium of the board of directors of the Association of Peoples of the North of the Yakut ASSR, candidate of history, docent: "Where Is a Man of the North Supposed to Study?"]

[Text] At last, the idea of the creation of a university of the peoples of the North of the USSR, it seems, does not call forth any doubts with anyone. It was supported by the founding congress of the Association of the Peoples of the North of the republic and by the congress of the small peoples of the North, which took place in the spring of this year in Moscow.

What are the arguments in favor of this idea?

At present there is virtually no institution of higher education in the country that specializes in the training of teachers of the native languages and specialists in the history and ethnography of the peoples of the North, reindeer-breeding, the hunting trade, fishing, sea-trapping trade, applied and decorative art, and popular handicrafts. It is impossible to develop the traditional sectors of the Northern economy without specialists who have a deep knowledge. On the other hand, only the development of reindeer-breeding, fishing, and hunting are for many Northern peoples the guarantee of survival and the continuation of themselves as independent ethnic groups [etnossy]. The industrial development of the Northern territories continues. The intensive urbanization of the population of these territories is under way. The new generation of people is quite frequently separated from the natural living environment of its people, it has a vague idea of the way of life and the tradition of its ancestors, and often it does not know a dozen words in the mother tongue.

The new institution of higher education is called upon above all to fill this gap.

The university of the peoples of the North must be created in the presence of an instructional and production base, which if only approximately meets the present-day requirements of the requirements of the average-statistical educational institution of the RSFSR, qualified scientific and pedagogic personnel, well acquainted with the special features of the Northern economy, the special psychological character and psychic cast of mind of the university-entrants, their way of life, their way of thinking, and, finally, their language, which is very desirable. In the selection of the location, the presence of an ethnic environment for the most rapid adaptation of the university-entrant, including conversational adaptation, as well as a ration of food prepared in accordance with recipes of Northern cooking.

In the region there must be economically stable economic organizations with traditional industries of the

peoples of the North. The presence of subdivisions of academic and departmental science, which study the problems of the North in general and the problems of the development of the economy and the culture of its peoples in particular, will become a decisive factor.

Are there in the country institutions of higher education and cities that meet these requirements? With respect to some points—yes, but in entirety—hardly. Not even Leningrad—the generally-recognized cradle of a whole generation of the intelligentsia of the peoples of the North—can boast. The Institute of Nationalities of the North was closed half a century ago. In some measure, its traditions are being continued by the Department of the Nationalities of the North of the Leningrad Pedagogical Institute imeni A. I. Gertsen. But its possibilities are not very great. Naturally, the question arises, where, in what region of the RSFSR, is it most preferable to open the university? In our view, the answer is unequivocal—only in the city of Yakutsk. Why?

Yakutsk is a solid cultural center in the northeast of the USSR. In the city with a population of about 200,000 people, a university and agricultural institute are operating. A significant majority of the more than 700 teachers of both VUZ's, among whom there are about 400 doctors and candidates of science, are engaged in scientific research which, to one degree or another, is connected with the Northern problems.

It is impossible not to take into account the fact that at the present time 26,300 Even, Evenk, Chukchi, Yukagir, and Dolgan live in the Yakut ASSR. To it are attracted the neighboring oblasts and territories in which 70,000-80,000 representatives of the peoples of the North, Siberia, and the Far East. Moreover, the Yakutsk has long ago become the place for the holding of all-Russian sports championships, festivals, exhibitions, forums of scientists, writers, etc. The city has the northeast's richest Museum of History and Culture of the Peoples of the North, a musical theater, Russian and Yakut theaters, a stadium, a Park of Culture and Rest, a State Philharmonic, the largest scientific library in the region, the State Archive, the "Gevan" Radio Station with broadcasts in the Even, Evenk, Chukchi, and Yukagir languages, and other institutions. In the next few years, the creation of a State Folklore Ensemble of the Song and Dance of the Peoples of the North, a cultural center for arctic civilizations, and the publication of a periodical press in the languages of the peoples of the northeast of the USSR.

The urgent necessity of opening a university of the peoples of the North of the USSR is also indicated by the fact that more than 20 scientific research institutions are concentrated here, in which about 1,500 staff members are working. In some of them, for example, in the Institute of Language, Literature and History, the Institute for the Economics of Integrated Development of the Resources of the North, the Yakutsk Scientific Research Institute for Agriculture, and others, there are departments and sectors for the problems of the nationalities of

the North. Other institutes, too, have independent scientific directions for them. All in all, more than 200 specialists of the scientific-research institutions of Yakutsk are directly studying the problems of the peoples of the North, with about 40 of them themselves being representatives of the nationalities of the North.

In this connection, the question also arises about the creation of a scientific center for the study of the problems of the peoples of the North. In many countries of the world, fundamental research laboratories, scientific centers, or institutes are usually created at universities, through which a link between scientific programs of research with the educational process is created. The time has come for us to combine the efforts of the uncoordinated institutes, departments and sectors at institutes engaged in research on the problems of the nationalities of the North into a unified scientific institution at a future university of the peoples of the North in Yakutsk. The new educational institution will become an educational-scientific center for the training of specialists for the Northern region.

Of no small importance is the question—what kind of a university should the university of the peoples of the North be? It can be created without superfluous subdivisions, in particular faculties and dean's offices. The entire current work will be concentrated directly in the departments. The university could have no more than two divisions: The humanistic division, training specialists in languages, literature, folklore, archaeology, ethnography, and history of the peoples of the North, and a division for methods of teaching the fundamentals of the traditional sectors of the Northern economy, graduating pedagogues for the teaching of the fundamentals of reindeer-breeding, fishing, hunting, the fur and trapping trades, popular applied and decorative art, handicrafts, etc. in secondary and 8-year schools. The annual admission of university-entrants in the divisions during the first years may be set at 25, possibly 50, people.

The variant being proposed seems to us to be the most acceptable both from the economic point of view and from the point of view of the realization of many questions of a social, inter-national, ethnocultural, and language order. To carry out the preparatory work for the opening of the university, it is necessary to create an organizational committee or a public rector's office with the involvement of representatives of the Association of the Peoples of the North from all regions where the nationalities of the North live, to open an account for a university fund, to work out a curriculum and educational programs, to conduct work with respect to the selection of cadres, to find premises for the educational building plant, dormitories of students, teachers, and staff members.

The question of the opening of a special institution of higher education for the peoples of the North is becoming urgent, its further delay cannot be justified.

Anticommunist Demonstration in Moldavia

90UN2550A Kishinev SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA
in Russian 24 Jul 90 p 1

[Article by I. Koman: "An Anti-Communist Spectacle"]

[Text] Last Sunday, a group of persons numbering approximately 300-400 assembled in front of the building of the Moldavian CP Central Committee, shouting antiperestroyka slogans such as "Down With the Communist Party." Those assembled directed insulting words against V.I. Lenin and demanded that the monument to the leader be removed from the center of the capital.

Individual participants were inebriated and showed particular aggressiveness against those who did not share the anticommunist ideas and expressed a different viewpoint. The events developed according to a previously prepared scenario and one could feel a director behind the scenes.

It is a surprising fact that at present, when upon the initiative of the Communist Party, the process of renewal and democratization of society has begun and when the party is winning ever-greater authority, when a multiparty system is becoming a reality, certain forces endeavor to resort to the dictating of terms, threats and intolerance. These irresponsible actions are dangerous for perestroika.

Reaction to Moldavian People's Front Congress

90UN2550B Kishinev SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA
in Russian 20 Jul 90 p 3

[Unattributed article: "The Second NFM Congress: Responses, Judgments"]

[Text] The program documents adopted by the Second Congress of the Moldavian People's Front [NFM] have been received with varying responses in the republic. Particular criticism both from the communists as well as nonparty persons has been leveled against the anticommunist bent which can be traced in them.

We offer to the readers a number of collective and personal opinions which have been received from various corners of Moldavia.

Chimishliya. In virtually all the labor collectives of the rayon, people are indignant over the decisions of the Second NFM Congress on the unification of the Moldavian and Romanian languages and renaming Moldavia the Romanian Republic of Moldavia. In particular, the speaker from the Mikhaylovskiy Grain Receiving Enterprise, M. Khotinskiy, asked: Who empowered the NFM to raise the question of changing the name of the republic? This is the competence of the entire people and not a group of people. Those who have assumed the responsibility to resolve these questions are acting only on their own behalf.

Yaloven. If we were to reduce into one the ideas voiced by members of the lease collective from the Progress Kolkhoz which is led by V. Chimpoake, the brigade of vegetable raisers at the Ulmu Sovkhoz, the brigade leader M. Gutsu, the team of equipment operators from the Sovkhoz Vyatsa Noue, this would appear as follows: the NFM which has promised to defend the interests of the people has become separated from them, it has ceased to fight for their aspirations and has taken upon itself the powers to resolve questions and which the people have not granted it. Their resolution on the romanization of the Moldavian people, changes in the name of the language and on the formation of the Romanian Republic of Moldavia do not reflect the desires of the basic portion of the republic population.

The same opinion is upheld by the retired teacher from Khynchesht, D. Zdardan. He said that he was disappointed that the NFM is changing tactics and tasks. Its last decisions are in no way associated with the initial program of activity.

Here is a selection of telegrams from Beltsy:

"I am a resident of indigenous nationality of the Republic of Moldavia, a communist, and I express my disagreement over the decisions proclaimed by the Second NFM Congress. As a voter, I demand that I be asked whether I want to be a Romanian." Worker from the Beltsy mechanical Combine, V. Makhu

"I express my indignation over the last actions of the NFM which is acting on behalf of the entire Moldavian people. My ancestors, myself and my children were born Moldavians and do not want to be a Romanian people and live in the Romanian Republic. Do not fan interethnic hostility in the republic. Let us live peacefully, work and raise our children." Technician from the Garment Mill imeni 40-Letiye MSSR, M. Shkarebnaya

"The workers at the electric lighting equipment plant are particularly concerned that the sociopolitical situation is being heightened in the Republic of Moldavia by the NFM. At its congress a number of resolutions was adopted having an antisocialist, antidemocratic character. Threats are being heard to ban the activities of the party. Separatist attitudes are appearing linked with the creation of the Romanian Republic of Moldavia without admission to the renewed USSR, and the rights of the national minorities residing in the republic are being ignored. I was born a Moldavian, I want to live in Moldavia and not in Romania. I am against the outburst of nationalism and the attempts to split the Union and the party." Worker from the Experimental Section, L. Sterkul

Moldavians Discuss Leaving USSR

90UN2552A Kishinev MOLDEZH MOLDAVII
in Russian 21 Jul 90 p 5

[Article by N. Kuzmin: "Listen to the Voice of the 35 Percent"]

[Text] ...The "forbidden" referendums in Tiraspol and Bender showed clearly that an absolute majority of the

inhabitants of this region in no way want to secede from the union and that the decisions of the session of the republic Supreme Soviet are far from the liking of all. Along the Left Bank there has been a wave of popular assemblies and their decisions, to put it mildly, do not support the new political line of the leadership.

Last Sunday, there was a citizen assembly in Kamenka. By some strange (and possibly not so strange) mix-up, precisely on that day there were stoppages in motor transport. It was a difficult matter not only to reach Kamenka but also to leave it. The dispatcher of the bus station, M. Fagelskaya, who only on the third or fourth pass succeeded in explaining that the cold "you" in dealing with strangers was still preferable to the intimate "thou" stated that the trip to Kishinev, for example, had been canceled "due to the absence of passengers." The Tiraspol run was canceled shortly thereafter. To put it briefly, you had to leave Kamenka on your own; to Kishinev (and this was a trip of about 3 1/2 hours) there were some 15 tortured passengers standing in the passage. The cashier, T. Kostin, shouted to them, the "missing," that there would be no seats. There were no tickets for the daily runs from early morning. To put it briefly, circumstances clearly did not favor the assembly.

All the same at the settlement Oktombriye Stadium, the residents of not only Kamenka but also the surrounding villages had assembled. Around 6,000 persons were registered and in actuality there probably were more. They had assembled to express their attitude on a number of documents adopted at the session of the Moldavian Supreme Soviet.

A briefing speech was given by the People's Deputy to the Moldavian Supreme Soviet from Kamenskiy Electoral District No 195, A. But.

"The declaration adopted at the session on Moldavian sovereignty and the conclusion-estimate on the Molotov—Ribbentrop Pact have significantly complicated the sociopolitical situation in the republic. The Sovereignty Declaration was approved regardless of protests by a number of deputies who correctly drew attention to the possibility of a differing interpretation of several major points. For example, nowhere is it mentioned that sovereign Moldavia can also be sovereign as part of a renewed federation. Or: in the point about citizenship it does not provide that a citizen of Moldavia will simultaneously be a citizen of the USSR. Thirdly, any change in the frontiers of the republic, in our opinion, can be carried out only after a republic-wide referendum. However, all our appeals, requests and ultimately protests were disregarded. Certainly the voice of the three deputies from Kamenskiy Rayon was only 1 percent of the total number of the votes in parliament but we do represent 45,000 voters! At the session many deputies felt constant pressure. The most important decisions were taken in secret, without a referendum. The Second NFM [People's Front of Moldavia] Congress

Showed in what direction policy in the republic will now be moving. And now we should have our say. I feel that Kamenskiy Rayon should not join the Romanian Republic of Moldavia!..."

Applause. At the Kamenka assembly this was not heard for effect or upon command. Many at the Oktombriye Stadium said: Why and who needs this, to set the people against one another along nationality lines and erect barricades on the different sides? We have living peacefully and have not looked at the notorious fifth paragraph but have been judging by what sort of person you are. It is high time, once and for all, to cease speculating in the name of the people.

Here there were no polished speeches. What sort of polish can there be when, as in the biblical Apocalypse, the earth is slipping from under your feet and you do not know what will happen in the future and how your children will live.

"I am a Moldavian," said the chairman of the trade union committee for the local industry, M. Barkar. "Why am I to be deprived of my nationality and why do they want me to fight with my neighbors and friends? The decisions of the republic Supreme Soviet mean the gradual annexation by Romania. No one has asked us whether we want this or not. And how should we assess the words of Mircha Druk on the new Karabakh published in the newspaper KOMMERSANT?

"How many speeches have there been about a national rebirth, but it seems to me that we must now protect the honor, dignity of the nation, national pride and culture from these 'rebirthers.' I have another request: let us not split up the children! Let them grow up and study together, let them become friends as before! Otherwise, they will not forgive us for what we have done today."

"The time when we believed the lulling promises is over," stated Chairman of the Kamenskiy Rayispolkom L. Mateychuk. "The concern of people is growing. Social tension is rising. Demarcation and confrontation along nationality lines are continuing. In the present political games, it is advantageous to set the peoples of the Left Bank and the Right Bank against one another. The question is being exaggerated of a new administrative-territorial divisioning of the republic and replacing the rayons with districts. We will not allow the liquidation of Kamenskiy Rayon. We will not permit a campaign to expel persons of non-Moldavian nationality from the republic."

The People's Deputy of Moldavia from the 102d Electoral District (Rybnitsa), B. Akulov.

"No one from the center from now on will intervene in the affairs of the republic. Only we ourselves are capable of defending our civil and human rights. For this reason, Rybnitsa supports you!"

The speakers at the microphone came one after another and their voices broke as they were saying such important things. The overfilled bleachers responded with a roar of approval. I looked and thought to myself: There they are, the people from the land, they should be resting on the hot day off, spending time in the family and going about with their children and grandchildren. But the social situation itself has deprived many of their tranquility, their confidence in tomorrow and even today—they who are far removed from politics and the "Olympian" brawls pour out onto the streets, squares and stadiums to defend the legitimate right to human and civil dignity. Their heavy, tired hands are not accustomed to applause but what ovations greeted the proposal of the inhabitants of Kamenka, Tysareva and Kirsta to express a lack of confidence in the government and, personally in M. Druk, M. Snegur and I. Khadyrke for instigating interethnic hostility and demand their retirement. Clearly such an unanimous response from the assembly stopped P. Amarfiy, the instructor at the Kamenskiy Sovkhoz Technical School imeni I. Soltys, and who had signed up for the debate. Certainly precisely his speech as the representative of the NFM at the stadium was awaited with particular impatience and interest. Regardless of the repeated invitations, P. Amarfiy did not go up on the rostrum....

A result of the assembly was the Appeal to the Moldavian and Ukrainian Supreme Soviets. The first point in it was the demand to restore the Moldavian Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic as the guarantor of sovereignty, independence and the protection of civil rights and liberties of the peoples on the Left Bank (and all the peoples! as this was specially emphasized). Thus, the assembly of Kamenka citizens fully supported the decisions of the analogous assemblies in the villages of Khrustovaya, Rashkovo, Krasnyy Oktyabr, Kuzmin and others. In the separately adopted decision of the citizen assembly of the settlement of Kamenka the demand was expressed of condemning the decisions of the Second NFM Congress, to voice a lack of confidence in the republic government, to halt the action of the separate laws adopted by the Moldavian Supreme Soviet—those which would allow the start of a discriminatory campaign against certain strata of the republic population.

Thus, Kamenka has joined Tiraspol, Bendery and Khrustovaya. The decisions of similar assemblies and referendums are judged invalid and are roundly condemned. But it is time to recognize that this is the voice of the people. It must be heard. There must be no more passage of laws which, as was said to applause at the assembly, causes one portion of the republic inhabitants to rejoice and the other to cry. We must not, as was done in a television interview by the chairman of the Supreme Soviet, states that some 65 percent of the voters are behind you, forgetting the remaining 35 percent which is a million and a half people!... References to the support and approbation of the people now simply do not pass muster because the people—independently of nationality and religion—want to live in peace and concord

without being at the throat of their neighbor; in defending their national pride, they do not want to tread on the toes of those who speak a different language or have different ideas. We are on the eve of the continuation of the session of the Moldavian Supreme Soviet. We still have hope that the vote of those 35 percent of the voters and who initially were somewhat forgotten will now be heeded. Certainly in essence no one needs this separatism. There must be respect and peace for all....

Roundtable Participants Score Armenian Pan-National Movement Work

*90US1259A Yerevan KOMSOMOLETS in Russian
24 Jul 90 pp 1-3*

[KOMSOMOLETS roundtable materials compiled by M. Diloyan and Z. Vartanyan: "Before the Election?"]

[Text] This word was invariably present in the electoral platforms and speeches. It is constantly being used in the press and it is now accepted as a given by anyone who feels his responsibility for the fate of the nation. We too are confident that the nation can survive and endure during those difficult times only by rallying together all healthy forces, mobilizing them to surmount the main difficulties and problems and, above all, resolving the problem of the safety of its citizens.

The longest journey starts with a first step. Today we are merely at the start of this long step toward consolidation and, bearing this in mind, the editors of KOMSOMOLETS have also tried to do everything they could so that the chosen path be the only right one. That is precisely why, on a hot June day, despite being busy and despite the fact that the discussion did not promise to be easy, people representing different professions and political views assembled around the long editorial table.

The following participated in the KOMSOMOLETS discussion: **Valentin Sayko**, propagandist in a military unit, Yerevan garrison; **Karen Khachatryan**, responsible secretary, house organ ZA SLAVU RODINY; **Ashot Grigoryan**, chief, prevention administration, Armenian SSR MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs]; **Georgiy Adamyan**, chief, public order safety department, Armenian SSR MVD; **Vrezh Gabrielyan**, deputy chief of the Armenian SSR MVD political department; **Ashot Navasardyan**, head of the Armenian Republican Party; **Grant Khachatryan**, chairman of the Armenian Constitutional Law Alliance; **Gevork Mirzoyan**, representative of the National Self-Determination Association; **Vardan Vardanyan**, deputy commander in chief of the Armenian National Army; **Vartan Grigoryan**, KOMSOMOLETS editor; and **Artur Mushegyan**, APN correspondent in Armenia.

Also invited to attend the roundtable was the commander of the AOD [Armenian Pan-National Movement], the writer **Vazgen Sarkisyan**. However, for reasons unknown to us neither he nor other representatives of the AOD showed up at the meeting. This is doubly

regrettable, for in the course of the talk sharp assessments concerning the activities of this social organization which is popular with the people (as the elections for the Armenian Supreme Soviet indicated) were voiced.

[Vartan Grigoryan] All participants in the roundtable are well-informed people, for which reason I believe that it would make no sense to preface this talk with general considerations on how stressed and confused the situation in the Republic is. Allow me merely to formulate the procedural rules: There will be no arguing; even the most controversial view will be accepted for information purposes.

I ask all speakers to speak briefly, for a few minutes each, as to what is the main obstacle which hinders the reaching of the main objective: national and civic consensus.

Furthermore, we must also determine the ways you see as leading to surmounting the situation which is developing in Armenia.

Such is the topic of our present meeting. Who would like to begin?

[Grant Khachatryan] I believe that it would be suitable for our discussion to begin with an excerpt from the joint statement which was issued 5 February last, signed by the majority of organizations whose representatives are present at our meeting here, and by many others. It was addressed to the peoples the world over and was adopted in anticipation of the events which subsequently occurred in Armenia.

"Bearing in mind that all demands of the Armenian people are legitimate and proceed from the principles of international law and morality, and bearing in mind that the peaceful reunification of Nagornyy Karabakh with Armenia is irreversible, the most important guarantees for national security and peaceful development are national statehood and a national army. These tasks can be best accomplished with the United Nations assuming control over the situation in Armenia and the holding of a referendum with a view to defining Armenia's political status and establishing a national parliament and a national army under the aegis of the United Nations. Based on the principles of universal human values, peace, and neutrality we, the undersigned organizations, proclaim that our struggle is a struggle for national liberation and is aimed at the restoration of national statehood and is not aimed against any other nation. We also want to stabilize the situation and to resolve national problems by political means. We condemn any display of violence against the struggle for freedom and independence and are ready to rebuff anyone who threatens our holies. We welcome anyone who will give us assistance in the creation of a free, independent, and united Armenia."

I deem it necessary to point out that to this day not one of the organizations which have signed this declaration, namely the Union for Constitutional Law, Association

for National Self-Determination, the Miatsum Association, the Armenian National Army, and the Association of Armenian Women, has withdrawn from the principles it enumerates.

[Ashot Navasardyan] Let me add that at that time the ONS [Association for National Self-Determination] had not become divided and that the Armenian Republican Party, which was subsequently created on its basis, are also supportive of this declaration today.

[Vartan Grigoryan] Although we have deviated from the main topic of the talk, I believe that what was said is equally important. We must determine the political stance of every participant in our dialogue, both as an individual and as the representative of one organization or another.

[Grant Khachatryan] In order to answer the question raised at the start of our discussion, let me say the following: Having no guarantee that the problems affecting it will be given a political solution, the Armenian people are today facing one of two choices. Some of the people, influenced by fear, are forced to accept the illusion that Armenia can resolve its national problems under the protection of the empire, within its framework, to participate in its reformist programs and to subordinate itself to it as an obedient performer.

Another part of the people, who firmly support the restoration of Armenian national statehood, are struggling precisely for that. All of this is preventing the Armenian people from having a unified national program for action and being able to confront the difficulties which, incidentally, originate not in Armenia and are not determined by the demands of the Armenian people but are related to the natural course of universal human development and changes in the polarization of forces. This is my view.

[Vartan Grigoryan] Would you care to be more specific? How will this take place and who will play what role in this process?

[Grant Khachatryan] No, my words apply to the people, for if, in the final account, the people reach a single common view, the Republic's organizations and leadership will implement the will of the people, the will of the Armenian parliament. Now each political organization which wishes to represent the interests of the people relies in its activity not on the people as a whole but on some popular strata. In my view, the people's unity can be achieved only if a single national idea is developed and supported by the people.

[Vardan Vardanyan] I fully agree with Grant's view but would like to express it in my own words, to make clear that we have discussed this question entirely independently of each other, and that our conclusions are the result of the discussions over the past three years.

The problem of Nagornyy Karabakh has not been resolved. Consequently, there is a reason for the division within the people and, hence, the respective deployment of forces.

Most of the representatives of forces which believe that the empire in general will not resolve this problem are attending this meeting and have joined forces. Unfortunately, several organizations are not represented here; we cannot view their absence as deliberate.

From my viewpoint, such roundtable meetings are useful. They contribute to the joint formulation of a unified national idea and we would like them to be repeated. The road to unity is long and difficult, and I believe that we must reach agreement at all cost.

There are forces which link, to one extent or another, their hope for the solution of their problems to imperial reforms. I see, essentially, the existence of two such forces, two sides of the same coin: the Communist Party and the AOD. I retain the right to tell the truth and to call things by their right name. No consolidation can be achieved as long as we have not explained to our people that the AOD is pursuing a treasonable policy toward the nation. Its policy consists of the following: **perestroyka, democratization, and glasnost**. This is their only solution for the salvation of the nation. They have announced that they will follow the constitutional path which was proclaimed three years ago and which led the nation and its policy into a dead end. Today the activeness and enthusiasm of our consolidated forces will determine whether we shall be able to explain the truth to the people who have blindly accepted the AOD policy, and that the salvation of the nation lies only in the activities of forces rallied around the common idea. I would also like to say this: The Armenian Communist Party is idling while the policy of the AOD is tending toward subordination to the Russian-Turkish-Zionist triangle.

[Gevork Mirzoyan] I believe that Grant Khachatryan and Vardan Vardanyan have expressed themselves quite clearly and logically. Let me add the following: There is yet another factor which hinders our national unification: the presence of the Soviet Army on Armenian territory, allegedly called upon to watch over our people but, in fact, instead of performing its direct functions interfering in our national liberation movement. Some of the Armenian people, having been frightened, believe that its presence is necessary. Yet all of us know perfectly well that at any time the Army could leave Armenia or, while being here, organize a slaughter. As long as the Soviet Army is in Armenia it will be difficult for us to unite. However, unification is inevitable although, true, most likely at the cost of great sacrifices.

The presence of the Soviet Army greatly damages the cause of our unity and independence.

[Vardan Grigoryan] Allow me to ask for a minor elaboration. Are you referring precisely to the Army or to the

units of MVD internal forces operating in the Republic and in the NKAO [Nagorno Karabakh Autonomous Oblast]?

[Gevork Mirzoyan] In general, any army unit sent by the center cannot help us resolve our national problems. Its task is only to suppress our movement.

We alone can solve our problems, both domestic and external.

[Ashot Navasardyan] Let me say that I have repeatedly expressed this thought to Generals Shurkov, Pishchev, Shatalin, and Lisauskas. Whenever they have asked what must be done for the Republic and Nagornyy Karabakh to regain their tranquillity within the shortest possible time I have invariably answered: Withdraw your internal troops and we and the Azerbaijanis will sit down at the conference table and resolve our problems without the participation of a third force.

[Vardan Grigoryan] Does the comrade from the MVD wish to speak?

[Georgiy Adamyan] In my view, you have made the problem complicated. It seems to me that the main problem now is the fact that we do not have a unified coordinated program. It seems very strange to me that when at one of the sessions of the Armenian Supreme Soviet Genrikh Igityan suggested that a Republic program be drafted, he was booed and forced to leave the rostrum before he could finish. Yet without such a program it would be difficult to hope for a solution to other problems. From my viewpoint we must all of us immediately gather and, on the basis of reciprocal concessions and compromises, reach a consensus.

The people are following the various organizations, sometimes not understanding what they stand for. Supporters of different organizations may be found within the same family. It is under such circumstances that we are dealing with such difficult problems. All of us must unite for the sake of the main idea.

[Vardan Grigoryan] I suggest that this discussion stick to a specific and clear line. I would like to ask all participants here a question.

Could it be that what is happening in Armenia is a named struggle for power?

Rejoinder Yes, one can clearly say that it is.

[Vardan Grigoryan] On whose part?

[Vardan Vardanyan] The AOD.

[Vardan Grigoryan] Only they?

[Ashot Navasardyan] We too are struggling for power. We would like to have a place in a multiparty parliament.

[Vardan Grigoryan] Are you struggling for your parties to assume power?

[Vardan Vardanyan] We stand for an alternate power.

[Vardan Grigoryan] But then an alternate state power already means a split within the people, taking us to the brink of civil war. Actually, I have no argument with everyone having the freedom to present his views.

[Grant Khachatryan] On 24 April the SKP [Alliance for Constitutional Rights] stated that it will aspire to seize the power in order to have the possibility of implementing its political program. We are struggling for a place in the parliament. The state must provide conditions for everyone to be able to express his political beliefs. Otherwise, as stipulated in the Declaration of Human Rights, the state itself becomes the source of tension and extremism.

[Vardan Grigoryan] Your position is very clear, thank you for the clarity.

[Ashot Navasardyan] I believe that unification is not a mechanical process. The people must have a single objective. Unfortunately, the people have all too many ways to attain it.

[Vardan Grigoryan] You are not far from the truth.

[Ashot Navasardyan] Today the authorities are short of the resolve to rally all political forces. They are not allowing other organizations to use their possibilities. With such a background, they are considered extremists and dangerous to society. Also organizations which reflect the viewpoint of the majority are insufficiently decisive, which makes our struggle ineffective.

[Gevork Mirzoyan] The National Self-Determination Association does not aspire to power as such. Our purpose is to restore Armenian statehood and independence and we need the power strictly in order to reach this objective.

[Vardan Vardanyan] One of the principles of the ANA [Armenian National Army] is its nonsubordination to any given party. We deem it necessary to subordinate the Army to the multiparty Armenian parliament. The ANA believes that not only the establishment of statehood but also of a national army is its task, a restoration after the bolshevik aggression of the 1920s and the annexation of Armenia by the bolsheviks. In our view, Armenia today is on the threshold of creating a third republic.

[Vardan Grigoryan] In the course of the discussions the view was expressed that the Soviet Army is just about the main culprit for our political problems. Let me emphasize that in no way is such a viewpoint insulting to the Army. The people are simply expressing their viewpoint. Let us hear from the representative of the Army.

[Valentin Sayko] Today we are discussing rather difficult problems and our dialogue only confirms that the process of national unification in the Republic is a painful one. I fail to understand why was criticism expressed

here of the Army and the view that the Soviet Army in Armenia is obstructing the reaching of a national consensus.

Not once has the Army interfered in the processes which have been developing of late in the Republic. An example of this is the creation of ANA units. Regular units have not influenced this process in the least. Nor have they obstructed the creation of other armed formations although there have been repeated clashes between us and such groups. I could give you specific facts of the month before last. Such cases have taken place as you know perfectly well. We, military personnel, are concerned with the following: Why is it that you, representatives of political organizations, having undertaken to raise military detachments, did not immediately place them under sufficiently strict control in order to avoid "negative" facts? This is not merely my opinion but is the question being asked by many members of the military. Why are weapons being seized without anyone determining where and how such weapons will be obtained? I realize that the Republic's government has not resolved this problem. However, it should have been asked to resolve it, for seizures of weapons lead to clashes with military personnel who legitimately bear arms and face criminal charges should they lose them.

I would like to know your views on the further legitimate raising and structuring of the ANA and of military formations.

[Vartan Grigoryan] I would like to ask the following: Is there in the Army an unwritten order according to which it must influence the political situation?

[Valentin Sayko] Let me simply answer that no written or unwritten stipulations of this kind exist. In no case does the Army intend to influence the political situation. Incidentally, let me note that we have always been in favor of meetings with representatives of the public organizations and a dialogue. We favor contacts in order to organize a reciprocal understanding and eliminate conflicts with the various informal organizations.

[Vartan Grigoryan] On the subject of the creation of the ANA let me say the following. The right of any nation to self-defense is sacred, and as long as it remembers this right it is alive. Furthermore, we must not forget that the memory of the people determines various actions. After the October Revolution, the only front which was stripped of Russian forces was that of the Caucasus. The forces pulled out on Trotsky's order, leaving an entire nation helpless in the face of the enemy. Therefore, we must take into consideration this fact. Nor could there be any two opinions on whether the nation has the right to self-defense. This is a genetic memory which makes us realize the need for self-defense and for the existence of armed detachments. The degree to which they are subordinate to the political parties is a different matter. This question must be raised most seriously, so that the people, the public, can understand us. The people see what is taking place around them. They mistrust all

armed forces, including a national army. The very idea is becoming discredited.... I would ask all of you to express yourselves on this matter.

[Vardan Vardanyan] Allow me to add something to the thought you expressed on the withdrawal of the Russian forces from the Caucasus front. There also was Lenin's secret order to distribute all the weapons of these forces among the Muslims, despite the fact that this could have raised the question of why only among them and not the Christians, or why not both?

The ANA has a principle: Never clash with the regular army but solve all problems peacefully and do not involve the people in an escalating violence.

At the proper time we prevented the withdrawal from Armenia of 21 tanks. By blocking the roads and the railroad tracks we prevented this and we considered that the entire ordnance on the territory of Armenia should remain here, regardless of whether or not the Russian Army will stay in Armenia. If Armenia is a sovereign Republic within the USSR why should it not have its own Army? The Republic's authorities must make their decision and proclaim its sovereignty. The USSR Constitution includes an item on the sovereignty of republics while the Republic's Constitution does not. The most important feature of this statute is the creation of a National Army. This right is granted to every nation. We had armed formations until 1937. They were eliminated with the 1936 Stalin Constitution. In World War II they were restored to promote "competitiveness" among the nations, as to who would fight better. The Armenian divisions covered the glorious path and, to the best of my knowledge, it was precisely one of them, I am referring to the division commanded by Nver Safaryan, which was the first to enter Berlin.

These forces were disbanded in 1956. One after the other, our military schools were closed down. The old residents of Yerevan know how many of them there were.

In the last 10 years Armenian draftees have not been assigned to combat units but to construction battalions. This made our slavery double. We were ordered to build for that state but had no right to acquire military skills. This rule was not applied to the Azerbaijanis. According to my information, most soldiers in the missile troops are Muslim. What the Kremlin is thinking I have no idea.

I have a suggestion to make to the representative of the Armed Forces, which is as follows: Organize an auction at which written-off combat ordnance would be sold, and indicate where we could acquire it, together with ammunition. The military has this right and possibility and it was used by the neighboring republic. The weapons we took are essentially for training and you are familiar with their quality. Only one out of four cartridges can fire. So, let there be an auction.

The ANA maintains quite close relations with the representatives of the Armed Forces and you should not be astonished to meet in my home General Surkov or find me in his. The reason is that they know that we have never favored confrontation. Furthermore, the ANA has had nothing to do with the seizure of arms. No single detachment has participated in attacks on the military. I am confident that this shall be the case in the future as well. No single attempt will be made to seize weapons from the Army.

[Vartan Grigoryan] But who should be held responsible for the behavior of such detachments?

[Vardan Vardanyan] The so-called AOD. At the time they were planning an action at X, accidentally, four days before that I found out about it and went to the board of the AOD and proved, as a professional, the foolishness, the perniciousness of this step. Present were Vazgen Manukyan, Vano Siradegyan, and Ashot Manucharyan (who left soon afterwards). If I am not mistaken, Ashot Navasardyan was with me. Do you remember it?

[Ashot Navasardyan] I do.

[Vardan Vardanyan] Nonetheless, four days later the operation was carried out. In the course of it they also fired at Azerbaijani fighters, at regular troops and at our boys. All of you know the result. They did this especially for the sake of enhancing their reputation in the eyes of the people on the eve of the elections.

[Vartan Grigoryan] Did you not try to stop them?

[Vardan Vardanyan] We did not believe it possible to do so, for we are not recognized by the Armenian Supreme Soviet and have no specific status. We can only advise and suggest.

[Ashot Navasardyan] Let me make more specific the thought expressed by Gevork Mirzoyan concerning the Army. I would not say that the active Army is in Armenia a force which creates instability. The internal troops of the USSR MVD and, I do not know how they call them, either the "Red Beret" or the "Greens," behave very impudently in the Republic, particularly in the border areas. You are familiar with the latest event in Vardenis, where such units fired at our formations which were at a great distance from the border. We are familiar with cases of our people being kidnaped. In the course of the meeting with General Surkov I reported this to him, for he is an Armenian SSR deputy to the USSR Supreme Soviet and, being well-familiar with the Armenian people and their history and respecting them, he should do everything possible so that no such impudent sallies occur.

[Gevork Mirzoyan] May I speak?

[Vartan Grigoryan] Please do.

[Gevork Mirzoyan] I fully agree with A. Navasardyan's arguments. But let me say the following: I do not believe the claim that so far the Army has not interfered in

politics. We would like to have a clear idea of the functions of the Soviet Army. If its purpose is to protect us, we could do this by ourselves. Why is it that when the Armenian government proclaimed that the Republic would be part of the USSR the question of its own Army which would defend its own people was not discussed. The Army exists for the defense of the interests of the empire and is in our country precisely to this effect: to prevent the solution of national problems.

[Georgiy Adamyan; Not all of the currently existing parties have declared that their objective is to be in power. There are all too many different organizations. In Georgia they are much fewer, there are no more than four. I believe that the desire for power of any party would lead to bloodshed. However, this is my personal opinion. I believe that the Republic's government should recognize the creation of the ANA. This problem must be resolved through joint efforts within the law.

[Karen Khachatryan] In my view, no one could guarantee that as a result of the elections a situation will not be created in which a given party could assume the power. No one can be entirely confident that said party will not make use, to this effect, of its armed detachments. In order to prevent such a situation all parties must disband their armed units and the Supreme Soviet must pass a resolution on the creation of a National Army. Global practical experience shows that there is no country with several different armies. This is my personal opinion. A National Army, which could protect the interests of the people, should be created within the shortest possible time.

[Georgiy Adamyan] Allow me to ask one question, directly related to this topic. Should we restore the national formations which were disbanded in 1956 but which were stipulated in the Constitution?

[Ashot Navasardyan] Naturally, we should.

[Georgiy Adamyan] Do you see the connection between the creation of a National Army and the restoration of the national formations? And if you do, why should this question not be considered with the conclusion of a Union treaty?

[Ashot Navasardyan] It would be good for such units to be organized and for Armenia to have an army, but only if they would be totally under the control of a national parliament and not become an instrument for the far-reaching imperial objectives. Such an army must obey the will of the people and its parliament. Otherwise we shall once again become a toy in someone else's hands.

[Vartan Grigoryan] In other words, you believe that assigning to the Center the duty to defend the people is wrong?

[Ashot Navasardyan] Naturally. Regardless of to whom it is assigned, whether to Armenians, Russians or Turks.

[Vrezh Gabrielyan] Let me clarify this point. Would this be wrong in general or specifically in the case of

Armenia? For there have already been cases in which, in a federal state, such functions have been performed by the Center, quite well at that.

[Ashot Navasardyan] This is wrong for us, for Armenia. As to federalism, what do we actually mean by this term?

[Ashot Grigoryan] Let me say this: As long as the problem of Nagornyy Karabakh has not been resolved, i.e., as long as the Armenian people have not obtained a just resolution, tension, uncertainty, and chaos develop among the people. Above all, mistrust of the central authorities and, subsequently, of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee and the Republic's Council of Ministers has developed. This also is the result of our errors, something which we do not deny. A stress situation has appeared and the people do not trust anyone. They are displeased with everyone. The "truthful" information which we receive from the central press and television has also played its sinister role. This is a one-sided lie, and all of us know this. A pro-Muslim policy has been adopted, which is noticeable. We are familiar with the Turkish reaction to any event occurring in our country. Hence the conclusion that the Armenian people must simply have their own Army. As to how to create it and what mechanism should be applied, this becomes a different matter.

[Vartan Grigoryan] Why is it that with such a stressed situation in Armenia the people have no guarantees concerning their safety? I ask everyone to express himself on this matter.

[Ashot Grigoryan] We are doing everything possible and we are doing it in such a way as to prevent any suffering by the people. It is true that for the time being we are not entirely succeeding. Mutual mistrust is quite high. We must hold more frequent meetings and exchange views in order to reach joint decisions.

[Vrezh Gabrielyan] I have waited for my interlocutors to finish. Allow me now to express my opinion. The point is that when we speak of national consensus we must know that a multiparty system is impossible without struggle and, naturally, that all parties are struggling for power. The question is how can they attain this power, through what means? To have differences is natural. What matters most, in my view, is that everything must be for the sake of the good of the people. In order to achieve this, we must have order. Nothing can be accomplished without maintaining proper order in our country. We must determine what groups are worsening the situation through their actions. No one is willing to assist in the exposure of criminal groups. If everything is to be in order, we must act cautiously and not harm the interests of the people or alarm the public. Regrettably, in this no one has come to help us. Here is an example: Representatives of the AOD appealed to the prosecutor and the minister of internal affairs with a request to take urgent measures to intensify the struggle against crime. They, as well as representatives of other organizations, met with MVD personnel. A talk was

held, in the course of which we said that we must meet with all formal and informal organizations in order to reach a specific decision and we agreed on holding a new meeting. So far, however, no such meeting has been held.

As long as chaos and anarchy will prevail in the Republic we cannot achieve a national consensus, a fact which could have tragic consequences. Today it is very important for all groups, formal and informal, to do everything possible to mount an aggressive struggle against crime with actions rather than words. In the final account, law and order must triumph and no one needs empty slogans. The people are totally fed up with them. We must stop the criminal armed hand which, using threats and terror, tries to keep the population in a state of fear. We shall readily assist anyone who gives us a hand and we shall ask for help for the sake of the interests of the people, regardless of personal interests. This demands, above all, law and order. It is precisely the law which must stand above all else for the internal affairs personnel and that is precisely what guides us.

[Vartan Grigoryan] If you please, I have a very short question addressed to the representative of the MVD and to the representatives of the informal organizations. Would it be realistic to set up a standing consultative council to coordinate matters for each specific case? Is this possible or not?

[Valentin Sayko] This is simply necessary, and the sooner the better.

[Ashot Navasardyan] We are speaking of details, forgetting the main thing. Such work must be coordinated by the authorities above all. As long as this does not take place no such agency can be established.

[Vartan Grigoryan] The result is that any party could declare that it refuses to obey the authorities, for they are ignoring the interests of the people. We must acknowledge the Supreme Soviet, newly elected by the people.

[Vardan Vardanyan] I disagree.

[Vartan Grigoryan] Explain your view.

[Vardan Vardanyan] Let me say that I see in the work currently being done by the informal organizations, the parties, and the armed detachments the possibility which would enable the nation to rally on all matters.

[Georgiy Adamyan] A situation has been created in our country leading to the psychological indoctrination of the people in a spirit which could be described as total permissiveness. A generation is being raised under these conditions and in a few years we shall be forced to re-educate it. Matters in Yerevan have gone so far that specialists in communications which carry special delivery letters and collectors have gone on strike; cab drivers and city bus drivers do not go to work at night. Crimes are being committed in the name of the informal organizations. However, these organizations bear no responsibility whatsoever for such actions. Therefore, the militia alone must resolve such problems. Here is an

example: Dumps containing explosives in the Republic are unreliable protected. This year, there have been 41 officially recorded cases of home-made explosives blowing up, which have cost the lives of 19 young people. Who is responsible for this? No one. Everyone says, it is not us. Yet someone should be responsible. Compared with 1987, the number of crimes has increased significantly. A person is killed in the middle of the day in a square in Artashat and no one does anything but only "urges:" go, investigate.

[Vartan Grigoryan] Forgive me, but you spoke of the "mentality of total permissiveness." On the other hand there is a paralysis of power. Wherever the law enforcement authorities should act quickly they are beginning to shun responsibility. This applies even when they are able do something. Here as well you are avoiding responsibility.

[Georgiy Adamyan] The law enforcement agencies are the mirror of society and of the authorities, and if the authorities, as we acknowledge today, have weakened, also "guilty" of this fact are the opposite forces. Therefore, they too should share the responsibility for the increased crime rate and the diminished efficiency of steps to protect law and order, i.e., they too should struggle against such acts alongside us. Otherwise the weakened struggle against crime will be a clear indication that society is marching toward catastrophe.

[Grant Khachatryan] Let me point out that there is a parliamentary crisis and that we are wasting our time speaking of the new parliament, for it has not been fully organized, and no one knows when this will occur. In our country this situation has lasted for at least a year. Let me also note the role of the Army in this connection. Remember the day 24 November 1988. While the Armenian Supreme Soviet was in session, unexpectedly a totally unwarranted curfew was imposed.

It was precisely then that a change took place in the minds of the people. Many of them lost their faith that national problems in a colonial country can be resolved by strictly political methods. Nor should we underestimate the fact that many processes in Armenia are being controlled by deliberately creating a situation in Nagornyy Karabakh. Thus, the lack of protection Nagornyy Karabakh's population led to the feeling throughout Armenia that self-defense was needed. This feeling was enhanced by provoked interethnic clashes along the entire Armenian-Azeri border, following which which some government weapons and ammunition were uncontrollably looted.

I am confident that, the lack of control in the issuing of arms was, to say the least, on the initiative not of the commanders of the rayon internal affairs department or even the secretary of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee. Such an order could have originated only from the very top. This was done for a specific purpose, in order to create in Armenia an extremely unstable situation.

[Grant Khachatryan] We are in the process of shaping a national statehood and it alone will enable us to avoid all sorts of scandals. Until then, alas, they will be inevitable. However, as of now we could accomplish something through joint efforts. Some 20 independent organizations are already giving some thought to this. If the authorities are unable...

[Vartan Grigoryan] Or unwilling?

[Grant Khachatryan] Yes, naturally, this too is possible, for this is a political matter. However, the Armenian leadership is facing elections but not even this is a valid factor. The leadership obeys 70 to 80 percent of the time the will of Moscow, and does not even understand that the process is irreversible. It is not taking any counter-measures. For this reason, let us dedicate all our forces to the common objective, and we shall see how within a short time we shall be successful.

[Vrezh Gabrielyan] All of us must join efforts in the struggle against crime, which has greatly increased of late. If we are unable, through joint efforts, to stop the growth of the crime rate, this will become more difficult in the future, regardless of who is in power. It will be very difficult for the people.

[Vardan Vardanyan] We must not link the question of raising up an Army to the uncontrolled bearing of weapons. Tension is growing in the Republic. For the time being, the MVD is unable to ensure proper order. The situation is such that the birth of the third republic is taking place with great difficulty, bearing in mind also the difficult economic situation and other numerous problems which await their resolution. The Republic has set up armed units but, unfortunately, not all of them are performing their direct obligations. Some of them use this opportunity to commit various crimes. Here is an example: The Echmiadzin AOD unit remained a member of the ANA for no more than 1 week, after which it announced its withdrawal from it. However, there are also detachments which, from the very beginning, have been unwilling to cooperate with the ANA although, nonetheless, still acting in its name. We have created a coordination council and have demanded that the Armenian Supreme Soviet officially acknowledge the existence of the council. This is the only realistic way.

[Vartan Grigoryan] Since we represent some social forces, could we issue the following declaration: We shall consider unlawful all detachments whose activities lead to the worsening of the tension and to division.

[Vardan Vardanyan] If this statement is not acted upon it will not be worth issuing. I do not see this statement as being realistic.

[Grant Khachatryan] I would not like that the impression be created here that we are encouraging crime. I believe that we should note the fact that the uncontrolled issuing of weapons pursued two purposes: to create chaos within the Republic, and to depict all armed people as criminals. History recalls examples in which conflicting

parties have called their ideological opponents enemies of the people and destroyed them as criminals the moment they came to power. Every Armenian must realize that if he acts the way the opponents of our independence are planning, he is pouring grist into the mill of our enemies. It is only the courts of a democratic law-governed state that can determine once and for all and with full legitimacy who is a criminal and who is a patriot. Once the question of the national statehood has been resolved the other problems will be resolved as well.

[Ashot Grigoryan] The assumption was made here that it was on the basis of superior orders that the militia distributed weapons in such a way as to allow them to fall into the hands of criminals. This is inconsistent with reality. I can formally state that weapons were acquired through a variety of ways by all organizations. The point is that initially the members of the AOD were more passive. Subsequently, however, they too tried to catch up. Let us say that weapons were acquired by 10 groups. Could you claim that in all of these groups such weapons were obtained by suitable individuals and that the armed people will use the weapons for noble purposes? Who among those present here could guarantee that not one of the armed individuals will use the weapons for self-serving purposes? No one. The conclusion, therefore, is that such people render poor service to the national movement and to our people. We can and must interact with the informal organizations.

[Grant Khachatryan] The MVD is an executive authority and it could be issued corresponding negative instructions.

[Vrezh Gabrielyan] During the armed attacks many members of the MVD were killed or wounded. One should not say such things.

[Ashot Navasardyan] An atmosphere of mistrust exists in Armenia. Various organizations—formal and informal—and the militia do not trust each other, and therefore there are no guarantees at all that the enemy will not set some of them against other. The central authorities and some people in the Republic pursue corporate objectives and as to crime any group would be capable of engaging in illegal actions. This is the result of the fact that weapons are being taken by members of the poor strata, people considered risky, not by intellectuals, and that such people are difficult to locate. The political organizations have no proper status, which prevents us from working. We would like to obtain guarantees that the criminal groups will be totally eliminated. There is talk that informals could make a coup d'état. This is excluded, for the armed formations were created for purposes of defense and not of overthrowing the government. We are seeking a parliamentary way and aspiring not to seize the power but to participate in political life. I do not know of any public organization in Armenia which would attempt an armed coup d'état and I have never heard anything of that sort.

[Georgiy Adamyan] We speak not about disarmament but request that the regulation weapons be returned to the militia. A total of 974 individual weapons were seized. These are hundreds of pistols. Can the homeland be defended with a Makarov pistol?

[Grant Khachatryan] Do you have proof that people in the border areas have been issued weapons?

[Georgiy Adamyan] I can tell you that we have obtained automatic weapons all of which were delivered to rayon departments in the border areas. We are ready to assume the obligation and responsibility for ensuring the safety of the citizens and the protection of their constitutional rights and the safety of their persons and property.

[Grant Khachatryan] Is Nagornyy Karabakh part of this zone?

[Georgiy Adamyan] No.

[Ashot Navasardyan] Were these weapons issued by the central authorities?

[Georgiy Adamyan] Yes. The weapons were issued by the Center. However, we are worried by the trend of the past years of disarming the militia. In Yeraskh, when they were fighting with carbines and pistols, no one disarmed them. Gradually, however, attacks on and disarming militia patrols became commonplace. All of us are prepared to defend our citizens and it is precisely the militia that is operating on a more or less organized fashion.

[Gevork Mirzoyan] Could the MVD issue an additional instruction to the effect that contingents of armed formations and detachments of the militia are assigned to the border areas?

[Georgiy Adamyan] Yes, this can be done. I would like to clarify also the question of the personal and property safety of the citizens with militia forces. In 1990 the local budget of the Armenian SSR called for 939 regular patrol militiamen. At the present time, however, these forces are not participating in the maintenance of public order and in guaranteeing the safety of the citizens (particularly in the Republic's border areas), for we are in the process of filling vacant positions and training the newly hired personnel. Therefore, 1990 is a very difficult year for us. Next year, however, we shall absolutely have sufficient forces and facilities despite all that has been said here.

[Ashot Navasardyan] If the troops begin to do here what is being done in Nagornyy Karabakh, would the militia be able to cope with criminals or do we have to take up arms merely to defend ourselves from the Azerbaijanis? To this effect do we have internal troops? Is the Armenian MVD a tool in the hands of the Center which is pursuing its own designs?

[Vrezh Gabriyelyan] In order for the MVD troops to carry out any given operation in the Republic a resolution of the Supreme Soviet Presidium is needed. The MVD will obey exclusively the Armenian Supreme Soviet.

[Gevork Mirzoyan] Let me say the following: The names of some MVD units should be changed to, let us say, defense units. This too would inspire the people.

[Vrezh Gabriyelyan] All the changes taking place in the country will be reflected in the MVD structure as well. Possibly there will be depoliticization among us as well. This will depend on the quality of the work of the parliament and whether there will be a legal protection.

[Ashot Navasardyan] We seem to be reaching the conclusion that independence is simply necessary.

[Vrezh Gabriyelyan] No one denies this.

[Ashot Navasardyan] We must restore our statehood, at which point these problems will be resolved to one extent or another; halfway decisions, however, will not yield any results.

[Vrezh Gabriyelyan] Meanwhile, we must see to it that the blood of our compatriots is no longer shed.

[Grant Khachatryan] We must have our own policy which, unfortunately, we do not have. We have an objective and, within a couple of years, the majority will understand it.

[Vartan Grigoryan] The task is to develop an inner trust and agreement among all interested organizations. No Armenian should yield to provocations. If there is mutual trust all problems will be resolved.

[Georgiy Adamyan] You may not trust me but the activities of the militia should be trusted. A structure is needed in the struggle against crime, all the more so today. Someone just mentioned that all the militia can do is follow orders....

[Grant Khachatryan] It is difficult to trust when we remember the way one year ago a militia captain, ignoring the electoral law, went after me and disabled me for a month. This could be repeated. Everything possible must be done for such incidents no longer take place.

[Vrezh Gabriyelyan] We are trying to prevent such incidents.

[Georgiy Adamyan] I believe that KOMSOMOLETS should look at IZVESTIYA on the subject of General A. Makashov and the event at the Evartnats airport. This is a very interesting topic, which has been left unstudied so far.

[Gevork Mirzoyan] Gradually everything will return to normal after our national independence has been restored.

[Grant Khachatryan] There are problems which must be resolved before the restoration of independence. They are quite numerous.

[Artur Mushegian] All formal and informal organizations must rally and organize their activities jointly with the MVD. We should not wait for the elections. We have a rather bitter experience of the way all this time, for one reason or another, elections are being postponed, and we should not be waiting for the newly elected parliament to pass laws while the number of crimes goes up.

[Vardan Vardanyan] We are already implementing some measures together with the MVD we could inform you about them.

[Artur Mushegian] The number of crimes is continuing to increase. The people are becoming embittered and losing faith in everything. Let me cite two examples: three days ago in the Cheremushki area two adolescents fired at a girl with a Nagan. An unidentified individual threatened a girl with a pistol not far from the Armeniya Hotel and tried to rape her. Actions by such criminals are triggering a mass psychosis.

[Vartan Grigoryan] I suggest that all participants express their suggestions and wishes. KOMSOMOLETS appeals to all participants in this meeting to express their wishes to the editors.

[Vardan Vardanyan] I believe that establishing a military-political council, which should be recognized by the Armenian Supreme Soviet, would provide real opportunities to the people. I must point out that if the press wishes to be popular with the people it should be in the center of events of vital importance to them. I am always ready to participate in such meetings. We do not have our own press and television or any passion for meetings, and we cannot take the truth to the people. The more frequently meetings are held, the better.

[Karen Khachatryan] In my view, the force which a normal situation will create in the Republic will be a National Army which will act in accordance with the law.

[Vartan Grigoryan] Will you serve in our National Army?

[Karen Khachatryan] Absolutely.

[Valentin Sayko] I am pleased to have attended this meeting and to have heard the views expressed by the representatives of all of the organizations. I have a different opinion concerning a National Army. However, since the question has been raised, I am in favor of the creation of such an army. But let us think, for meanwhile there is no real force which should take everything in its own hands. This also applies to the growth of crime and the uncontrolled wearing of arms. Yes, there is a crisis of power but since we are living in this precise time, there are members of the ANA and members of other organizations who enjoy the trust of the people. All of us together will act, for today it is

Armenian young people who are joining the Armed Forces and we are interested in what they think in joining the service. I would like the representatives of KOMSOMOLETS to come to our unit where Armenian boys are serving and acquaint themselves with their life and problems. It is possible that later these boys will become part of the National Army. How will they serve in it? Why has the question arisen of defending the Armenian borders with the help of the ANA and the fact that the Soviet Army is not justifying the hopes? Does this mean that Soviet troops will be withdrawn from Republic territory and that the ANA will assume all defense functions or else will a certain portion of the Soviet Army remain and, together with the ANA, carry out its assignments? I support all of this: All the necessary steps should be taken to put an end to crime. We now have raised one company because armament dumps in the district were attacked. Using two KamAZ trucks an attempt was made to seize weapons. This means that urgent steps must be taken. We are interested in stabilizing the situation in order not to be distracted by guarding railroads but engage in the performance of our direct obligations.

[Ashot Grigoryan] Thank you for organizing this meeting. I favor the creation of the ANA and would like to submit the following suggestion: In my view it would be good to meet on a weekly basis to discuss specific cases of violations of the law and with joint efforts to prevent undesirable excesses and identify individuals who could commit them. This roundtable, which was quite well organized, has provided real possibilities for further meetings, even if once a week, for half an hour.

[Georgiy Adamyan] I believe that the creation of a National Army is necessary. Let me point out, however, that this must be done by creating national military units within the country's Armed Forces and for the government to set up an authority which will decide on the size and nature of the interaction with the country's Armed Forces. Only thus could we have a combat-capable army with which to protect the Republic and the country. The Armenian government must undertake to do this.

[Karen Khachatryan] It is a good thing that these days the MVD as well is dealing with this problem. We are saying that what is needed is a coordinated action against the criminals. Such meetings are necessary and one should not avoid them.

[Ashot Navasardyan] I am pleased that a roundtable was "organized." Such meetings should be held more frequently. We must exchange opinions and learn more. Problems of internal life affect everyone and we must join efforts. Every citizen must be interested in this, for we are the masters of our country. The Armenians have taken up arms to protect themselves. The creation of a National Army is necessary. The ANA must be a National Army subordinated exclusively to the Armenian Supreme Soviet.

[Grant Khachatryan] I believe that the ground for all crimes was laid not today but many years ago. This includes corruption, bribery, and many others. Today all that has taken place is an increase in the number of particularly dangerous crimes. In order to struggle against this evil it is simply necessary to develop all the structures of a national independent state. The first step should be the formation of a National Army. The main problem now, however, is achieving reciprocal trust among all healthy forces in society.

[Vartan Grigoryan] Allow me to thank all roundtable participants and say good-bye until the next meeting.

Editorial conclusion We realize that despite its length, the roundtable covered only a small percentage of the most sensitive and vital topics and that many questions remained unanswered. We believe that the range of round-table participants as well could have been substantially wider. For that reason we do not intend to end this discussion but await themes, suggestions, views, and questions. We find it very necessary to know the opinion of our readers as to what views they find interesting and who they would like to see at the KOMSOMOLETS round-table at the next meeting. Let us remember that all the participants in this meeting have expressed their readiness to pursue this work and to answer to any questions of interest to the readers. We are waiting for mail addressed to "roundtable."

Armenian Dissident Manucharov Comments on Imprisonment, NKAO Crisis

90US1257A Yerevan KOMSOMOLETS in Russian
2 Aug 90 p 2

[Interview by Gagik Karapetyan with Armenian SSR People's Deputy A. Manucharov: "One for All and All for One?"]

[Text] The interview-expose of Armenian SSR People's Deputy A. Manucharov, released from custody after serving a year-and-a-half in Shusha, Lefortovo and Butyrskiy investigation isolation cells; and today, enjoying the achievements of the "epoch of glasnost," which has dotted nearly all the "i's" in his marathon duel with now-former Senior Investigator for Especially Important Cases at the USSR General Procuracy, K. Maydanyuk.

[Karapetyan] On 7 June 1990 KOMSOMOLETS published the interview-confession of Konstantin Karlovich—in which, in a rather lengthy conversation with me, the taboo of press silence with respect to the "Manucharov Case" was lifted. As it turned out, this case was the last in his brilliant 17-year career in the procuracy organs. As I suspected, an exceptionally avid reader of this conversation was—Arkadiy Manvelovich himself. In anticipation of his reaction, for the first time in my journalistic career I stuck out my own journalistic "neck," and naturally, turned out to be almost the last in the line of those who had an interview with A.M.

While expressing my gratitude to the readers of KOMSOMOLETS for their long-suffering, I must point out their one indisputable advantage: fate has decreed that your obedient servant served as a "second" for both sides in the duel of the two "M's" in the press. And now a few traditional sentences about the "technology" of relations with the duelists under the "coded" initials, A.M.: From the day of his return to Yerevan, the two-room hospital ward, with all the conveniences and a city telephone was in essence transformed into a reception room for Armenian People's Deputies. He was to have been treated for the many ailments that he acquired within the prison walls, but he withstood the almost round-the-clock attacks of the "doctors" (it goes without saying, without white coats), who in spite of the patient's health, both physical and spiritual, without prior arrangement, dumped upon A.M. the whole, mighty "waterfall" of political events and phenomena which had taken place in Armenia and Artsakh during the time he was behind bars.

We got together to talk on two mornings in July. Unfortunately, the shortage of newspaper space does not permit describing everything that is ordinarily presented under the rubric, "for the first time in print." Everything in its turn. For this very reason, let us today concentrate on the second act in the duel of the "epoch of perestroika."

It would be dishonest if I did not admit that, as was expected, not all of those around A.M., or more precisely "the team," was pleased with the K.M. interview. Especially the fact that by way of the hyphen (considering the temperature of our conversation) it had the precise genre-shading of a "confession." Finally, certain people were in no way "pleased" by my journalistic venture of a dialog-by-correspondence, which was nevertheless to a certain extent a unique dialog between a former subject of investigation and his former investigator. The only mitigating factor is that we are all students not only in the first classes in democracy, but also at the same time in pluralism of opinions, which are quite often mutually exclusive. There's nothing to be done about it—in one's life one can, and at times must, look at things through someone else's eyes. Yes, the dioptrics and focal lengths can be different, and not suitable for your eyes—on the other hand, you may sense that you are under the gaze of a "stranger."

I got the impression that it was exclusively A.M., convinced that he was right, who understood the meaning of the newspaper "skirmish," which was at first glance essentially without guile. On his side the honor and nobility inherent in the celebrated duelists of Pushkin's time were manifested to the highest degree: at his left hand lay my questions to A.M.; at his right, a folder with a complete transcript of my conversation with K.M.

While weighing his answers, A.M. resolutely refused the opportunity offered him, to take a look, as they say, at the last page of the book with the "answers to the riddles." And that is the way we held the conversation:

directly, extemporaneously, for the tape-recorder. Without a rough draft, we went directly to the final copy, just like Arkadiy Manvelovich's entire past life—almost 60 years, including the year-and-a-half of forced, unnatural isolation from the outer world and from us, his fellow countrymen.

[Karapetyan] And so, the first question—the same one announced in the postscript of my conversation with K.M.: What would you say to him, if you had met after reading his interview on the pages of KOMSOMOLETS??

[Manucharov] I would have asked him the only question in the following manner: "Maydanyuk! What do you think today: Were you right or not when you were torturing me at the behest of our 'bosses'?" If he had answered, "Yes, I am guilty," I would have firmly grasped his hand. However, if he had begun to twist his internal feelings and the relationship he displayed to me as demanded "from above," then I would not ever want to speak to him.

[Karapetyan] Let us return to the period of your arrest. When you became acquainted with Maydanyuk, how did he behave toward you?

[Manucharov] It was in mid-November, the year before last. In Stepanakert. At the party obkom. I did not want to go there, but upon the recommendation and insistence of then-first secretary Genrikh Pogosyan they invited me, saying that the USSR procurator simply wanted to get acquainted with me man-to-man and have a chat. Later I understood that (First I was seen by USSR Deputy General Procurator Khitrin, and later K.M. also came in) they were studying, so to speak, my manner, in order to further plan their measures before the arrest.

The second time I saw him was in Shusha Prison, when on 30 November K.M. came to me in the cell of a condemned man; a general, although young, and not only with respect to his age, but also according to the information that I learned prior to my arrest: an austere, well-educated person, with great authority and potential possibilities—just the kind of official that our administrative-command system trusts to carry out such assignments. And he greeted me with so brusquely at our first meeting behind bars.

[Karapetyan] Apparently you had guessed the cunning tricks which they were carrying out behind your back even before you were treacherously arrested in Yerevan, and then transported to Shusha?

[Manucharov] I had always known: my political convictions were my principal "guilt," and the so-called economic violations in my work—were merely a pretext. The Special Administration Committee and the national Procuracy had carried out "artillery preparation" for my arrest in advance. The first "salvo" was the spread of various kinds of rumors for the purpose of demeaning

me and my human dignity as the leader of the Karabakh Movement, enjoying the trust of the entire Armenian people.

Once again it is mid-November 1988. The finest sons of Artsakh dropped in at my working office—Roles Agadzhanyan, Robert Kocharyan, Ernest Ayrapetyan and Boris Arushanyan. It seems that Volskiy had summoned them and told them: "Go to Manucharov and tell him: you are a corrupt person; you are leading the Mafia. We have finally established that A.M. has a three-story house in Yerevan which cost nearly a million rubles, with a 100-meter swimming pool"; that from my personal assets I had distributed 100 rubles each to all the people of Karabakh. By simple arithmetic one can deduce that we are talking about a sum of more than a million rubles. The farther you go, the more: I, they say, had supplied bedding for all the refugees arriving from Sumgait, from my personal possessions, and so on.

"How could such a thing be?" my comrades asked with surprise, of course not believing the lie. But I understood: it was precisely via my comrades-in-arms that the attempt was undertaken to discredit me, and to "bury" my authority. The second "salvo": blackmail through certain persons and even women. Finally, Volskiy directly proposed that I immediately flee Artsakh: "And so, it would be better if you get out of here!" (Hearing such a thing I was reminded of the "epoch of stagnation," and the insistent "advice" of the powers-that-be to our famous dissidents, headed by Academician Sakharov, that it would be better to go abroad.—G.K.)

Both my comrades-in-arms from "Krunk" and all the positive forces of our people perceived this factor incorrectly: They thought that if I would leave, they would leave me in peace and not arrest me. However, I understood their plan immediately. The scenario of the Moscow emissaries consisted of, after achieving my departure from Stepanakert, loudly announcing: "Now it is clear to you who your leader is—when the going got tough, he abandoned you and set out for home."

[Karapetyan] Let us return to our main "hero," K.M. How did he treat you in the course of the interrogations? Did he act crudely toward you?

[Manucharov] In the early days he would always arrive with Col. Khromov—an investigator from USSR MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs]. How did K.M. conduct the investigation? Even if we would converse for five hours straight, we had to look one another in the eye. Both of them tried to force me to accept the accusations cited above. They came right up to me, but of course they did not lay a hand on me. Because they knew who was carrying out what kind of "mission," and the kind of prison in which they put me: "Let's get in the car and go right now, and we will get right to the point" (They had in mind the presence of a detached house).

I am ashamed to admit it, but in my entire life I've never owned anything, not even a bicycle, with the exception

of a four-room state apartment. I do not have any detached houses, dachas, or automobiles, and never have...

[Karapetyan] Moreover, for some reason we are talking not in that three-story house, but in a hospital ward—true, it has a balcony and a government refrigerator and television set....

[Manucharov] In the process of the entire investigation I proposed the following "game" to the investigators: "Let's suppose that I sign an official statement on all the vast properties which you ascribe to me—and then you propose showing what I have listed." And what did they answer? Do you know? "That is not your affair—should it be necessary, we will even offer a photograph, where you are standing at a detached house, opening its doors." What you have heard is not just a fantasy. It was just a little awful to understand that they wanted to arbitrarily, falsely accuse me, and that "they" were capable of practically anything.

Later on the investigators accused me of being in debt to the state amounting to many thousands of rubles. For the first time I will reveal to the press my own personal savings account, which contains...42 rubles and 70 kopecks. Yes, we have a rather large family: two sons and a daughter. Formerly our overall budget used to reach 1,500 rubles a month—half this sum I used to earn as director of a building materials combine. And I also managed to take part in working out some collective inventions (for about three-tenths), for which I have 16 certificates from VOIR [All-Union Society of Inventors and Efficiency Experts].

I have dedicated my entire life to build and do good to people—therefore, in no way was my previous way of life a preparation for such a twist of fate, as serving time in prison. I never could have (even in my wildest dreams) thought, that the highest ranking members of Soviet jurisprudence, right up to the USSR General Procurator, could bring such accusations, with such unique tendentiousness and deceit.

[Karapetyan] Incidentally, what is the news from the USSR Procuracy and the nation's Supreme Court since the time that you flew in from Moscow to Yerevan? Are you aware of the attitude of Sukharev himself toward the present situation—since, as my colleagues in the capital have told me, Sukharev lodged a protest, which was, it is true, not approved by the USSR Supreme Court, when he returned from abroad and discovered that you had been released from custody with a signed statement that you would not leave [the country]?

Having amended the pre-trial detention measures, I was set free. But if one wants to make an exact count of the hearings of my "case," it was heard twice by the Brest Oblast Court; four times by the Belorussian Republic Court; and the last time, by the nation's Supreme Soviet. And not one time was I invited to the session, although no one passed any kind of sentence on me. Although my

defense lawyer Yuriy Markovich Shmidt kept me well-informed of the lack of results from these many sessions, it was clear to me anyway that the investigative group was not capable of finding any kind of evidence nor any incriminating facts. And this, in spite of the fact that by my own approximate calculations, during the 1.5 years of the "Manucharov Case," nearly 120 specialists took part (and are engaged to this day), sent to Stepanakert from various regions of the country. It is their misfortune that they have not found anything significant, nor shall they...

[Karapetyan] Not even with the help of two Japanese computers, which the investigative organs began to use.

[Manucharov] According to information from my fellow-workers at the building materials combine, our entire archive has been ruined at the hands of the investigators and other specialists; they have gone through the documents and examined them so many times that they have literally read holes in them. And I repeat, to this day they have not established anything of significance.

[Karapetyan] What role did Sukharev personally play in your "case"?

[Manucharov] Under conditions of my isolation in prison I could not have had such information. But I knew: every time, when my question was examined on the part of the USSR Procuracy, Sukharev for some reason personally tried to accuse, condemn and designate for me a certain period of incarceration. The most vivid example took place on 15 March of this year, when, after the second examination the Brest Judges decided to return the "case" for further investigation to the USSR Procuracy, and I was released from Butyrka, the pre-trial detention being changed. However, the impossible happened—such a decision was realized only after four months. You will agree that it was hardly that the Brest Court had ruled against itself: here, either Sukharev himself, or someone a little higher switched on the well-known pressure and arm-twisting mechanism. While I was in Butyrka and other prisons, I received all my information of a general political nature by means of radio broadcasts, and from the newspapers, most often PRAVDA, hearing or reading the speeches of Gorbachev or Lukyanov. For example, when at a session of the USSR Supreme Soviet they discussed Article 96 of the nation's Fundamental Law, it indirectly touched upon my question as well; but they torpedoed it and blocked my "case," thereby demonstrating the arch-tendentious attitude toward me personally.

[Karapetyan] I don't know how or from whom I've gotten the feeling, that for all of them you have turned out to be almost a personal enemy?

[Manucharov] To complete your question one might add: Why did they think that way? I have to say that neither Soviet rule nor utopian socialism made an impression on Artsakh, as they did in other regions of our country. We have lived and continue to live as a

third-class nation; we are oppressed, like a colony, in administrative subordination to Azerbaijan. The epoch of stagnation lasted for all of 70 years in Nagornyy Karabakh; and here a certain Manucharov became a "thorn in the flesh" for Moscow, a "beam in the eyes of the Kremlin."

[Karapetyan] In our conversation, K.M. made mention of Sukharev's initiative to release you after his meeting with the USSR People's Deputies. Just what happened, in actual fact?

[Manucharov] Let us return to May of last year, when the Artsakh people categorically demanded my release, appealing directly to Volskiy. He in turn traveled to Moscow, where he met with the USSR General Procurator, after which he spoke on Stepanakert Radio—"Things are not going badly with Manucharov. His materials have been sent to the court. The legal proceedings will take place in the near future, and we believe that everything will be normal."

In those days I was still familiarizing myself with the criminal case. And it was then that my close friends and comrades-in-arms, USSR People's Deputies Zoriy Balayan and Vachagan Grigoryan were received by Sukharev, who told them: "If Manucharov signs an official statement today that he has completely familiarized himself with the case (at the same time that I had an entire month in reserve—A.M.), we will release him tomorrow."

They immediately summoned my wife, Irina Vagarshakova, to Moscow (To be honest, she was already in the capital, in continual anticipation of my departure from Butyrka), and my lawyer, who repeated to me the statement of the USSR General Procurator. On 16 July, I recall, after dinner I was taken to the USSR Procuracy building on Pushkin St., where I signed the official statement in the required manner, although at that time I had only read five volumes of the 23. My cellmates, when they learned of this news, rejoiced.

And suddenly the notorious mechanism once again operated against me—"my" case was then and there sent to the USSR Supreme Court. I think that here, Volskiy played a fateful role. If he had truly wanted me to be released from custody, that would have happened much sooner than now.

[Karapetyan] With respect to K.M., we left off with his attitude toward you, while you were in prison. Could you describe this in more detail?

[Manucharov] In the pages of KOMSOMOLETS he assures you that I was not locked up (laughs). To me it is both funny and sad: in fact, I was not in the lock-up. But in Shusha Prison, for the first 13 days, they put me in a solitary cell on death row, and for the next one-and-a-half months, they placed me with the category of prisoners called "stool-pigeons" in the vernacular (Because of the limitation on newspaper space, we may talk about them another time, although in the course of

our hours and hours of conversation with A.M. we devoted quite a lot of time to this "collection" of neighbors in all the isolation cells—G.K.).

As I recall, Shusha Prison is situated at an altitude of 1,400 meters above sea level. During the winter days, the temperature on the streets was minus 10 degrees, and it was still colder at night in the cell. The floor was made of paving stones; they took away my radiant heater; and they did not provide a matress—instead I received a casing with wadding, and my pillow was a block of wood. You know, I don't understand to this day, just what they were planning to put there: wooden chocks, or something a bit more solid...

When I mentioned all this to K.M., he would answer: "My business is—to conduct the investigation." With his connivance, during my nearly three-month stay in Shusha I lost 24 kilograms, and my chronic illnesses recurred once again: osteochondrosis [osteokhondroz], pancreatitis, heart pains, insomnia, and my right eye was very bad. And I'm not even talking about such "trifles" as the fact that they did not allow me to bathe, and shaved me only once, when the investigators recorded the interrogation on video. And then they took away all my documents and did not return them, and did not allow me to read a single newspaper...

[Karapetyan] When was the last time you saw K.M.?

[Manucharov] In April '89. At that time I was in Butyrka. Prisoners have two terms to describe investigators: the "stick and the carrot" [kнут и пryanik]. The first one in my case was, naturally, K.M., and the obligations of the second were meticulously carried out by his colleague in rank and function—Bazin. Whereas, every time, K.M. talked only about being shot or about a term of 8-15 years, Bazin for some reason would reduce my "sentence" to something less than three years. The hardest thing was the psychological pressure, when K.M. would threaten: "If thou wilt not take up [the testimony]..."

[Karapetyan] You mean he spoke to you with the familiar "you"?

[Manucharov] It would be better for him to use the familiar "you" (laughs), than the cultured, polite "you": "If you do not take up the testimony as we demand, we will be forced to arrest all the members of your family—and tomorrow you will hear the voices of your sons from the next cell." Those words were spoken to me in Shusha.

But Bazin, while talking with me would first offer cigarettes, knowing that his colleague Mikhaylyuk (also from K.M.'s group, put together to look into my "case") forbade me, a smoker, to smoke while familiarizing myself with the volumes of the criminal investigation. I even wrote an appropriate complaint on this matter. In a word, Bazin would try to persuade me to "lighten my own fate," having taken upon myself certain testimony. Thereby my punishment might be limited to work at

chemical enterprises. Moreover, with the help of Vol'skiy, I might be transferred to Stepanakert next, saying that my friend, USSR People's Deputy Boris Dadamyan should make this his concern, since he has friendly relations with the chairman of the NKAO Special Directorate.

Finally, I will quote Bazin: "If you meet us halfway, and take something upon yourself, I will talk with K.M.—and he, after all, is a man, and he will probably agree with our deal. And we will send an older person to the court, who will defend you for the sake of getting a humane decision. Otherwise, I would remind you that K.M. is an influential person. He can bring everything to the condition that he likes..."

[Karapetyan] On the whole, what kind of impression does K.M. leave you with? I have in mind his purely professional qualities.

[Manucharov] I must admit that he is a specialist of the highest order. When I talked to him I always asked myself: why is K.M. dealing with me in such a highly tendentious manner? I tried and tried to find an answer, reflecting: that means, he came to Stepanakert by way of Baku. I do not rule out the possibility of bribery. A second factor: Here is a young general, who during the times of the command-administrative system had purely careerist convictions, and now he turns up in Karabakh—the epicenter of the world democratic movement. Is it possible that K.M. was delighted with this situation, that he wanted to make a new career leap on the misfortune of the Artsakh people? And a third variant—that they are pressuring him, and are demanding he put an end to my "case."

Today, as I compare my constant meditation on this matter with his words about pressure on the pages of KOMSOMOLETS, I come to the conclusion that the other side had paid money for me. Probably they did not reach K.M., or else he would not have been able to let it alone and—I'll say it plainly—he would not have been able to back out. I think that the money would probably have reached and burned the hands of those who were pressuring him "from above."

[Karapetyan] As I understand it, you are beginning to hold the opinion that K.M. is but a minor player [vintik] in this grand political game around Karabakh?

[Manucharov] Yes, it was namely these convictions, purely human ones, and his mental anguish with respect to this that led Maydanyuk to the already well-known psychological conclusion to retire from such a high position, at such a young age and with such great prospects.

[Karapetyan] Did you yourself not try to use his "method" of communication: to look with your beautiful eyes—Excuse me, it is not proper for men to compliment one another—to stare right at him?

NATIONALITY ISSUES

JPRS-UPA-90-056
24 September 1990

[Manucharov] I admit, it was very unpleasant for me when I detected some kind of separate senses in K.M., methods of conducting an investigation by means of hypnotism...

[Karapetyan] What are you saying?

[Manucharov] This I can firmly repeat. I even thought of how I could escape from his fixed gaze in the course of many hours of interrogation. Because of the state of my vision I wear glasses. When he would "shoot" me in the eyes, I would prop them on the bridge of my nose (demonstrates) so that our eyes would not meet.

[Karapetyan] A fine countermethod—Necessity is the mother of invention, as they say.

[Manucharov] I finally understood: K.M. knows that Manucharov is not a "corrupted person," and that I was arrested primarily for my political convictions.

[Karapetyan] He partially admitted that in the conversation with me, if you recall?

[Manucharov] I thank you for that. Unfortunately, he admitted that while in retirement. But what unauthorized methods he used while trying to break me! Just so that I would admit to "at least something."

[Karapetyan] In conclusion I have a couple of brief questions. Your forecast with respect to the finale of your own case? When will the long-awaited end be put to it?

[Manucharov] On 29 May, the nation's Supreme court examined my question for the seventh time: the collegium decided to return my "case" for further investigation.

[Karapetyan] Although, as my well-known colleague Yuriy Vasilevich Feofanov justly asserted, such things do not happen in one single civilized state...

[Manucharov] I would like to make those words my own as well. Yes, the decision was taken to release me from custody. But I am certain that the USSR Procuracy will once again try to indict me. So that they will then not have to apologize to an innocent person who spent a year-and-a-half in three isolation cells in the country.

[Karapetyan] What do you hope for, if those same highly-placed officials are completely unable to summon the courage to apologize to the members of the Karabakh Committee, who were also groundlessly arrested, and then isolated from the outside world?

[Manucharov] I am—a realist. Therefore I believe that they will try to keep me within the bounds of the decision taken as long as possible, as if in their hands. Or, putting it figuratively, keep me in some kind of isolation cage. And the signed statement not to leave, which they took from me, obliges me to stay in Stepanakert. First of all so that while I am at large I will not forget to fear them, that they can do anything they wish with me. And secondly,

so that I would not take part in any political activity whatsoever. But I will tell you plainly, having made the following public statement: no one will ever dare, and does not have the right, to accuse me of violations in economic and political activity. If anyone ever dares to do so, you know that such an act is a complete fabrication. Therefore, I am not afraid today: I will work, and I will carry on my further political activity in the name of achieving those just ends toward which my Artsakh people have been striving for many decades.

In Lieu of a Postscript

Once again I must acknowledge the greatest difficulty of this principled article: in terms of volume, just imagine, it reflects only one-fifth of the recording of our conversation, tete-a-tete. Still another circumstance of considerable importance will not allow me to rest. On the same evening when Arkadiy Manvelovich in essence wound up our marathon conversation, Irina Vagarshakova sincerely (but not in the presence of A.M.) informed me that it was no coincidence—that after our frank conversation in the hospital ward, his heart began to flounder once again, and he began to chain-smoke...

Therefore I beg your forgiveness for disturbing him, and wish A. Manucharov the best of health. But my striving to stir up past experiences proceeded from the desire to know the TRUTH; and moreover, first-hand. To know it and to bring it to the readers...

Lvov Oblast Sets Up Own Customs Center

90P50068A Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 17 Aug 90 Morning Edition p 6

[Article by F. Ivanov: "Customs Officials' on the Main Highway"]

[Text] These days the highway leading from Lvov to the Soviet-Polish border several kilometers from the control checkpoint "Shegini" has one more checkpoint. In accord with the decision of the Lvov oblast Soviet of People's Deputies, the so-called "point of pre-customs inspection" began to operate here.

Young people in a resolute frame of mind, the majority of whom are activists in the local branch of "Rukh", obtained the right to stop and inspect each car travelling towards the border. The aim of the creation of this "voluntary customs group" is to protect the local market from the uncontrolled export of foodstuffs and manufactured goods by those leaving the country. As the heads of the oblast maintain, the flow of thousands of Soviet citizens and foreigners through the Lvov region have completely emptied all the local stores.

The volunteer "customs officials" order the drivers of the cars stopped at the checkpoint to show their baggage and fill out a home-made "declaration". Without this the vigilant militiamen stationed at the gate of the control checkpoint "Shegini" do not let a single outgoing car through. If the "group members" discover goods in the

car that are forbidden to export or the quantity to be exported exceeds the norm, they will either turn the driver back or demand that the excess be unloaded. Next to it a mobile purchase point is on duty, where they accept withdrawals with a 20 percent discount.

Practically from the beginning a detachment of militia has been on duty next to the "customs officials." This is not surprising; the majority of those passing through are not at all in the mood for such an "informal" inspection. There have been attempts to forcibly break through the border because of the unceasing loud conflicts.

A. Kolos, the head of Lvov Customs, considers that the introduction of an additional control point at least helps the customs officials on the border, but he does not call it legal. So by what law to the "group members" stop and inspect cars? For that reason the majority of tourists ride though other oblasts and do not purchase any goods at all in Lvov stores. But the prosecutor is silent and there is no one for those passing though on the highway to complain.

Most of the claims of the newly established "customs officials" were on Polish tourists. When it became known, the Polish authorities forbade the sale of goods brought in from the Lvov oblast in response to the sanctions of the Lvov Oblast Soviet. In relation to those [sanctions] other discriminatory measures were introduced. Perhaps this will force the zealots to change their minds about the fairness of those who call themselves "true democrats".

Lvov Area Streets To Be Renamed

90P50068B Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian
22 Aug 90 First Edition p 4

[Article by Lieutenant Colonel M. Zadorozhny: "From Yavorov in the Lvov Oblast: Stepan Bandera Street?"]

[Text] Not long ago residents of Yavorovskij Rayon in the Lvov region were surprised after having read material in the rayon newspaper ZORYA, entitled "At the citizens' discussion" signed by Yu. Horalevych, the deputy chairman of the Yavorov City Soviet of People's Deputies. It went like this: "In the course of the national-cultural rebirth, said the author, historical justice has gained a foothold. Prominent personalities of the Ukrainian people, who laid down their lives as sacrifices in the struggle for an independent common Ukrainian state, have been reborn after having been nonpersons. Their names are being immortalized in the names of streets and settled areas of our country." Further on the author acquaints the readers with the controversial proposals concerning the renaming of streets. These proposals, he said, were made in the town soviet by local residents. I will only name a few of these proposals. It is proposed that Lenin Street be renamed Andriy Sheptytsky Street, that Victory Street be renamed Stepan Bandera Street, that Komsomol Street be renamed Roman Shukhevych Street, that Sailor Street be renamed Yevhen Konovalets Street, that Geroev-Panfilovets Street be renamed Sich

Riflemen Street, that Pioneer Street be renamed Plastun Street, that Gaev Street be changed to Simon Petlyura Street, and Aviation Street be changed to Yaroslav Stetsko Street, etc.

In the words of Yu. Horalevych, the residents of the rayon would like the following streets renamed: Halan, Zhukov, Shchors, Ostrovskiy, Gagarin, Pushkin, Peace, Friendship and International.

So what do they intend to bring back to life in Yavorov? Is that not the "culture" that brought the Ukrainian people suffering and the blood of millions of victims during the Second World War? It seems that it is precisely that one.

Ukrainian National Flag Raised in Kiev

90UN2665A Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian
27 Jul 90 p 3

[Article by D. Yakovenko: "An Abuse of Democracy"]

[Text] The evening of 24 July witnessed the raising of a blue-and-yellow piece of cloth on the flagpost of the Kiev Gorispolkom. And on the following day Kievans who had been eyewitnesses of this event began to telephone our editorial offices. "For several hours a crowd of those people who hold political meetings paralyzed traffic along the Kreshchatik," one caller told us. Some excited young persons climbed up onto the roofs of trolleybuses and into trees.... How could our City Soviet allow such a thing?" All the callers expressed their indignation at what had occurred, and they inquired whether it was legal.

In order to provide an answer to this question, we familiarized ourselves with the operational summaries of our republic capital's UVD [Internal Affairs Administration], and we telephoned the office of the city procurator.

As already reported in the city's press, on 20 July the Kiev Soviet Presidium began to consider the problem of "Ukrainian National Symbols and Their Use in the City of Kiev." However, the Soviet's Presidium had not taken any final decision on this matter by 24 July. Nevertheless, preparations for raising the blue-and-yellow flag proceeded at full speed ahead.

At 1630 hours several thousand citizens assembled on the territory of the Sophia Architectural-Historical Preserve and near it (among them were some young fellows dressed in the uniforms of Sech Musketeers). The Autocephalous Bishop Vladimir of Ivano-Frankovsk and two autocephalous priests performed a ritual of sanctifying a blue-and-yellow flag measuring 3 by 6 meters. At 1745 hours all the participants in this combined political-and-prayer meeting proceeded, with this flag under escort of the "Sech Musketeers," to the gorispolkom building, where the session of the City Soviet Presidium was being held. And it was then that A.N. Mosiyuk, the deputy chairman of the Kiev Soviet, who was presiding

at that session, took the decision to raise the blue-and-yellow flag. He gave as his reasons for this action the fact that many people had assembled at the gorispolkom building and were blocking traffic along the Kreshchatik.

Here too another political meeting was held which caused indignation among eyewitnesses who telephoned us. The speeches by Ukrainian SSR people's deputies Vyacheslav Chornovol, Les Tanyuk, Oles Shevchenko, and other speakers were interrupted several times by crude, anti-communist slogans. At 1900 hours A.N. Mosiyuk raised the flag to the top of the flagpole. After this, about 2,000 persons who had assembled under the flag sang the song "The Ukraine Is Not Yet Dead."

V.S. Kalyuzhnyy, this city's deputy procurator, informed our newspaper's editors that, as long ago as 20 July the city procurator's office had sent a message to the Kiev Soviet Presidium that neither the presidium nor the session of the full City Soviet have the right to decide the question of national symbols for the entire republic, for all the people of the Ukraine. The Ukrainian SSR Constitution refers this matter exclusively to the jurisdiction of the highest organ of state power in this republic—its Supreme Soviet. Therefore, no decision was taken on this matter by the Kiev Soviet Presidium. And so the raising of the blue-and-yellow flag which was done on 24 July at the gorispolkom building must be deemed an arbitrary act. Furthermore, the existing legislation has provided that any flag set up in a public place must be registered in the appropriate manner. The ritual of sanctification cannot be deemed such a "registration." And so here too there is an obvious violation of the law.

A few days ago the Bureau of the Kiev Gorkom of the Ukrainian Communist Party noted that the extraordinary haste in introducing symbols in this city could lead to an exacerbation of the tension dividing people; it could cause instability in the city's sociopolitical life.

Yes, it is certainly the case that such actions are scarcely conducive to constructive dialogue. The advocates of the blue-and-yellow flag (and among them are a number of deputies from the republic's parliament and the Kiev Soviet) have obviously heated up passions to a very high point. It was the committing of just one more provocative action, one which constitutes an utter abuse of democracy. And this has been done at a time when the complex situation in the economy of our republic's capital and its other population centers requires the consolidation of all those for whom the future of our people is dear.

Many Kievans who called our editorial offices emphasized the following statement: "Such questions ought to be decided solely by means of a nationwide referendum!"

Some newspapers which have already responded to the events described above draw attention to the illegality of the action with the flag, and they cite some curiously interesting details about what happened.

N. Tsymbalyuk, a correspondent of VECHERNYY KIEV, describes the situation which evolved on 24 July in the City Soviet and around it in the following manner: "There was no quorum (in the Soviet's Presidium—D. Ya.) for adopting any decision. But something had to be undertaken. A crowd of people from the political meeting were swarming and seething just outside the gorispolkom building.... A protocol-type decision was approved concerning the raising of the blue-and-yellow flag at the gorispolkom. And this was carried out. In spite of all the obstacles, a compromise solution was found."

And so, a "protocol-type decision" and even a "compromise...." That is the way in which patently illegal acts are now being camouflaged.

Also evoking amazement is what S. Tsikor, the IZVESTIYA correspondent, reported on this same subject. He writes as follows: The many months of struggle waged by this city's new sociopolitical organizations for recognition of the old Ukrainian national symbols has ended in their victory. With the permission of the Kiev City Soviet Presidium, the blue-and-yellow national flag was raised."

For the sake of objectivity IZVESTIYA here also cites the statement made by V. Sinyukov, the republic's first deputy procurator, concerning the illegality of the above-mentioned "victory." But will the All-Union reader recognize or realize what the "permission" of the Kiev Soviet Presidium consisted of in and by itself?

Rukh Rallies in Kharkov Denounced

90UN2665B Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINIAN in Russian
8 Aug 90 p 3

[Article by L. Zamyatin: "Haven't They Stayed Too Long in the Trenches?"]

[Text] In Kharkov on that Sunday Dzerzhinskiy Square was filled to overflowing. Here things were under the control of the "informals" belonging to Rukh and the Ukrainian Helsinki Alliance, as well as the Ukrainian Republican Party, and the Ukrainian Language Society. Some speakers, without restraint in their expressions, poured mud on the Soviet regime, the CPSU, and the party obkom, whose building looked out upon this unsanctioned, political meeting. It looked out silently.

Not a single secretary, nor a single section head came out onto the square. Only a small group of instructors loomed by themselves on the sidelines and, stirred to indignation by the speeches they heard, shouted things like the following: "Not true! "That's a lie!" "Lies and nonsense!" It seemed that one of them would move to the rostrum and state the truth. Unfortunately, no such individual was to be found.

Within a week another political meeting with many thousands of participants was held. And again the "informals" predominated on the rostrum. And the

obkom members looked indifferently out upon the crowd from the windows of their own offices.

"It's really too easy for certain party committees to refuse to engage in such important ideological work as counter-propaganda," commented V.A. Goshovskaya, a delegate to the 28th CPSU Congress and to the 28th Ukrainian CP Congress, as well as secretary of the Balakleyskiy Party Raykom. "Just take these same political meetings on Dzerzhinskiy Square, which we somehow persist in calling democratic, even though there is no democracy without the execution of adopted laws. Such meetings allow the leaders of the "informal" organizations to constantly misrepresent and distort the facts, to turn everything upside-down. Because of a low level of cultural standards and an ignorance of their own history, some people accept this blathering as the genuine article. And not to rebut a lack of proof or substantiation is equivalent to losing one's authority."

There's no doubt about that. At times the "informals" use dishonorable or dishonest tricks. At the beginning of the current year they disseminated a rumor to the effect that Kharkov was just about to witness major outbreaks or demonstrations by the workers "against the communist regime." The leaders of the local section of the Society for the Ukrainian Language went even further: they "shared" the news with Munich's Radio Liberty. And the latter announced the following to the entire world: "On 25 February a mass demonstration by workers will take place in Kharkov. They do not agree with the policy of the Communist Party. In order to prevent this demonstration, the authorities have brought tank units into the city..." In point of fact, the city's inhabitants know nothing and knew nothing about any such demonstration. That is understandable; there were no tank units in Kharkov.

Here is where the party leaders should speak out at the next political meeting and tell people who's who and what's what. But no, the party committee has decided not to engage in polemics and not to refute anything. As a result, even nowadays there are some Kharkovans who gossip as follows: There's no smoke without a fire.

But it is also true that the oblast and city committees have continued to operate in the old-fashinoned way, just as if nothing were happening in the country and in the party. At times the local apparatchiks give no thought at all as to how one's words strike a response among the people. Here is a vivid example of this kind of thing. On 27 July an integrated political day was held throughout the entire Kharkov area. A discussion regarding the 28th CPSU Congress was conducted. It would seem that this

could be termed the topic of the political day. If our imagination fell short, we could have used our old, to be sure, not very luxurious, baggage such as the following: "Implement the Congress's Decisions!" or something along those lines. But the Political Day was conducted under the slogan: "We Are on the Right Path." This was on Friday. But on Sunday Dzerzhinskiy Square was howling with dissatisfaction. Sticking up above the crowd were hundreds of unpleasant slogans. Among them were some such as the following: "The Party Obkom Is On The Right Path, But What About The People?" "The People Have Not Kept Up; Only The Obkom Has Kept Up!"

The party officials should explain things to the people who are not keeping up! If the obkom is right, it must do this. If it has made a mistake or failed, it should take the blame for this. But no, the obkom members did not come out to meet the people. Again they remained observers on the sidelines.

In my opinion, V.A. Goshovskaya is right a thousand times over. She is disturbed by the following questions: "Haven't the party leaders stayed too long in the trenches? Haven't they let too much time slip by, time which is now so changeable?"

Kiev Rally Protests Destruction Of Lenin Monuments

90P50096A Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian
15 Sep 90 First Edition p 2

[Article by V. Demyadenko: "Meeting In The Ukrainian Capital"]

[Text] Last night in the Ukrainian capital there was a rally of several thousand city. The workers, writers, scientists, veterans of the Great Patriotic War, and armed forces personnel in attendance spoke about the wave of vandalism and illegal acts relating to the Lenin monuments, which has been occuring lately in the republic, especially in its western oblasts. The participants in this rally consider these actions to be uncivilized acts, as a manifestation of an anticomunist campaign by society's destructive forces.

The rally's participants supported the decision of the Presidium of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet concerning the illegal and intolerable nature of the destruction of the Lenin monuments which has taken place in a number of cities in Lvov Oblast.

L. M. Kravchuk, chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR, addressed the rally. After the rally, the participants laid flowers at the monument of V. I. Lenin.

Public Relations Departments Opened In Republic KGBs*90P50101A*

[Editorial Report] Several republic KGBs have recently opened public relations centers or have been engaging in other types of public outreach. For example, Alma-Ata KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian for 31 July 1990 carries on page 2 an article noting the formation of a new department of public relations in the Kazakh SSR KGB, and Frunze SOVETSKAYA KIRGIZIYA in Russian for 4 August 1990 carries on page 1 an article submitted by the public relations division of the Kirghiz SSR KGB announcing the creation of this division. Both reports explain that the department objectives are to inform the public of KGB plans and activi-

ties and to develop direct ties between workers and the KGB. Tashkent KOMSOMOLETS UZBEKISTANA in Russian on 3 August 1990 publishes on page 3 an interview with A.N. Blagorodov, deputy chief of the Uzbek SSR KGB press group, in which he describes a series of meeting between KGB employees and scientists', students', and workers' collectives. These meetings consist of a brief presentation by a KGB officer followed by a question-and-answer session, and provide the officers an opportunity to explain and defend their work at a time when "anything can be discussed in the media," and "people have wild impressions" of the KGB. In addition Minsk SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA in Russian on 17 August 1990 carries on page 3 an interview naming P.I. Geydich as chief of the Belorussian SSR KGB public relations division.

Editor Details Work, Functioning of Independent Journal GLASNOST

90US1274A Moscow ZHURNALIST in Russian No 6, Jun 90 pp 43-45

[Interview with Independent Magazine GLASNOST Chief Editor Sergey Grigoryants by Yelena Korolkova: "Only Freedom Teaches Freedom"]

[Text] [Korolkova] Sergey Ivanovich! A few words, if you please, about your publication for those who are not familiar with it.

[Grigoryants] The magazine has been coming out for almost three years now. In the declaration printed in the first issue of GLASNOST (June 1987), we spelled out three tasks, which we have set for ourselves: On the one hand, to acquaint broad segments of the nation's population with what is actually going on in it; on the other, to provide an opportunity to speak out to people who are unable to do this in the official press; and finally, an important task from my point of view is—to provide people in other countries an impression of events in the Soviet Union, since these events generate interest throughout the world, and a great deal depends upon them. You can consider that to a greater or lesser degree we are managing to do all this. We have in fact a very large information service; perhaps the largest among, shall we say, the non-state publications.

[Korolkova] And so it turns out that you are operating like a kind of agency, a unique kind of information center?

[Grigoryants] An information group. In addition to the magazine, we regularly publish—and note that not one of the independent editions beside ours simply cannot touch this—we publish the bulletin, YEZHEDNEVNAYA GLASNOST [The GLASNOST Daily], in which we publish news which for one reason or another did not appear in the official press, or which was from our point of view, not fully reflected in it, distorted, and so on. We have a large—nationwide—correspondent network, quite a solid group of operators, and a group of photographers. We cooperate with Western radio stations and TV companies. And we also have correspondents and publishers abroad. But we use western materials sparingly, for that is not the main thing for us.

We provide a great deal of various kinds of information to other publications—both to foreign publications and to Soviet unofficial publications; we have a lot of intake. Now we are very seriously considering establishing our own publishing facilities and our own printing plant.

[Korolkova] On the cover of one of the issues I noticed the words: "Published in Russian, English, Armenian, Bulgarian, Spanish, German, Polish, French..."

[Grigoryants] There are a great number of Western editions of the magazine: in France and the United States, for example. And GLASNOST is being renewed in Spain and Italy. It is highly likely that in time we will

begin publishing a GLASNOST-INTERNESHLN, that is, an illustrated general-European magazine, like TIME. At different times, the situation with issues published abroad varies. Right now the three stable issues published abroad are the English, French and Russian issues, the total circulation of which is about 40,000 copies. Circulation is small for the remainder, and we simply do not know about many of them, or we learn by chance.

[Korolkova] How do you evaluate the real influence of GLASNOST on the people's frame of mind?

[Grigoryants] I would say that it would have been more remarkable two or three years ago, when we were starting up, when an independent press was after all a new phenomenon. As evidence of this I would only cite the fact of how actively the Soviet leadership fought with us. In the Spring of 1988, the magazine was crushed...

[Korolkova] Do you connect this event with any specific articles?

[Grigoryants] Yes. Here, in my opinion, the connection is obvious. The fact of the matter is, that a Scandinavian newspaper reprinted two articles from GLASNOST, and this happened just at the time of N.I. Ryzhkov's trip to Sweden and Norway. We are talking about the articles by Vasiliy Selyunin on economic reform (Later, in a somewhat softened form, the article became part of the famous anthology "Inogo ne dano" [We Have No Other Choice]), and about my own article on a minor territorial dispute between the USSR and Norway. Both reprintings became the basis for some rather unpleasant questions asked of the head of state: Why, let's say, are you saying one thing, and Soviet specialists think otherwise? An attempt to refute Selyunin's conclusions with the help of the comrades from Gosplan was unsuccessful. And...you can imagine such a "coincidence." One hundred and fifty men in police uniforms, but without the necessary documents, not even a search warrant, broke into the dacha which we had rented entirely in accordance with the law, and took away everything the editorial office owned; and they arrested me and three of my fellow-employees for seven days, for "hooliganism." But we have continued to publish, although there was a time when we thought that each issue might be the last.

[Korolkova] How many issues did you put out?

[Grigoryants] Thirty-four. I would like to stress that GLASNOST is still the only "thick" magazine in the Soviet Union that is not associated with any kind of organization, and is truly pluralistic. We are not foisting off our own understanding of events; our pages are equally accessible to spokespersons for even the most minute social trends—religious, social, ecological, cultural, what have you! It is true, that having offered the floor to, let's say, the leader of PAMYAT, or having printed an article by Kolchugin (a collective pseudonym for the employees of one of the official publications) with an anti-Semitic bias, we also provide space to other materials which reflect a completely different point of

view on those very same problems. It is important that the reader independently determines the what and wherefore.

[Korolkova] To whom is GLASNOST addressed?

[Grigoryants] The audience of the magazine is one of our most serious problems, because it is quite simply impossible to limit it within a clear-cut, well-defined framework. This is an audience living in many countries, speaking various languages, and not at all equal in terms of education. This is the Soviet intelligentsia, this is the center, and this is the foreign reader who is interested in the situation in the Soviet Union; and this is our fellow-countrymen who are living abroad. In Paris, the circulation of GLASNOST is 20,000 copies, just as for RUSSKAYA MYSL, to which it is a supplement.

[Korolkova] And what is the circulation in the USSR?

[Grigoryants] Ordinarily, up to 10,000 copies, which for a 300-page publication (That is the average; at times it is larger) is considerable. GLASNOST began with 50 copies.

[Korolkova] Please name your "venerable" authors. I have seen familiar names here—Anatoliy Strelanyy and Viktor Perevedentsev.

[Grigoryants] We are printing a cycle of essays by Strelanyy about the situation in the country, which have been read on Radio Liberty. Vasilii Selyunin, whom we've already mentioned, and Aleksandr Medvedev work with us. We have the best, in our opinion, commentators from abroad, such people as: Mikhail Voslenskiy, Aleksandr Zinovyev, Vladimir Maksimov, Vladimir Bukovskiy, and Mikhail Geller. Also published are political figures and political pundits from abroad, such as Milovan Djilas, Vittorio Strada, and Alen Bezanson [sic]. Thus, to a certain extent the magazine is assuming an international character; although, that which is taking place in the Soviet Union, the Union experience is, of course, fundamental for us.

There is yet another principle which we have not to this day violated and do not intend to violate: We have never re-printed anonymous materials. Only originals, and only the primary source! If someone sends us a chapter, Voslenskiy, for example, then this is an unpublished part of his book, "Nomenklatura"; or if Zinovyev writes to us, then this is part of a book which is still in the planning stage. In the May issue of GLASNOST, we published an interview with Andrey Dmitrievich Sakharov; it had never been published in Russian, and more than likely was not published at all. We have given space here to a rather solid selection of materials dedicated to the memory of Andrey Dmitrievich, accompanied by his last photographs, which were made by our photo-correspondent Vladimir Sumovskiy. Artist Mikhail Slatkovskiy, who has received quite a number of prizes at international exhibits for his caricatures, has

joined the GLASNOST staff also. He, incidentally, is the chief artist for the magazine KHIMIYA I ZHIZN [Chemistry and Life].

[Korolkova] Do your colleagues from official publications willingly cooperate with you?

[Grigoryants] I believe so. At one time they were rather wary of our edition, and, on the whole there were grounds for this. Right now times are a little quieter; and, moreover, the magazine has acquired a certain authority. People are interested in the fact that their articles are reproduced in their original form, and are not sterilized by the efforts of official editors and censors.

[Korolkova] Of whom does the editorial staff consist? How is its work structured, and how are responsibilities distributed?

[Grigoryants] There are more than 40 persons on the magazine. On the whole these are professionals, although certain ones have acquired journalistic skills without leaving their "lathes." For example, nearly all the Moscow part-time correspondents for Radio Liberty have in one way or another worked with us. Just as everywhere else, we have department editors, editorial secretaries, and literary and technical workers. On Tuesdays, all the leading employees assemble for the editorial council (We have no board of editors), where current questions are resolved. We specialize by type of occupation: Viktor Rezunkov is occupied with news items; Mark Deych prepares materials for the "Echo" section, where responses to the basic events of the preceding month are printed; and Aleksey Myasnikov heads up the "Public Reception" section...

[Korolkova] That is a section, as I noted, to which you provide a lot of space, just as to the others next to it—"Letters and Appeals," and "Chief Editor's Mail." Do you really get a lot of mail?

[Grigoryants] Enough to completely fill up every issue; and we attribute special significance to this. I personally receive 5-6 letters a day, and my associates receive them too. Plus, all the phones ring almost continuously, and the duty person is always on the line. But the key factor of "feedback" is, of course, the GLASNOST reception area. Not only do our readers make use of it, but also those who have despaired in finding justice at state institutions and authorities, and have lost all hope. They, as a rule, then also become volunteer distributors of the magazine, and quite often provide information to it. The stories told in our reception area—which are most often stories of catastrophe—feed our reviews and essays, and serve as the basis of commentaries and documentary selections. Under the rubric of "Take the Good with the Bad" we report on what people have succeeded in, and on the other hand what they have not succeeded in doing.

[Korolkova] But can a magazine which until quite recently was out of favor, as if it did not exist at all, and which is not officially recognized, really help anyone?

After all, it cannot send, for example, a letter "for taking measures" as the open press can.

[Grigoryants] But you know, we do send them. Aleksey Myasnikov is accumulating a large pile of correspondence. And I will tell you, this is very hard work, which he has been carrying out selflessly for all of three years. And they answer us! But even more often, the official authorities themselves react; they are quite sensitive to GLASNOST articles; after all, its pages are reproduced in foreign publications... Owing to our involvement, people learn of the fate of an arrested relative, they are restored to their job, and others receive material assistance. After the disclosures loudly proclaimed in our magazine, the nation's chief psychiatrist was forced to publicly acknowledge that out of the five million people in the USSR considered mentally ill, two million would be stricken from the list; that is, it is completely obvious that not only were the so-called patients completely healthy and that the misuse of psychiatry has been the most massive form of repression in recent years—but that it is still going on. The sections, "Secrets of Soviet Glasnost," "Documents," and "The Glasnost Archive" are intended to produce a certain reaction.

[Korolkova] As I have learned, the thematic spectrum of the publication is broad—politics and religion, ideology and economy, and finally, culture. But here is what I have noticed: no matter what problems the magazine touches upon, on the whole it fixes upon the negative and the painful processes. It is as if it has become the rostrum for resistance to the system under which we live. But you see it is changing, albeit slowly, for the better. But where are the materials on, if not the bright side, at least the constructive side? It's easy to be negative...

[Grigoryants] Well, why do you say that? Comforting articles appear sometimes too. Not often, of course. What can one do? We are not exceptional in this regard; that is the general situation in the country.

[Korolkova] I hope that I will not make it difficult for you today, if I ask about the material basis of the publication?

[Grigoryants] For quite a long time GLASNOST existed on the basis of my honoraria. I was a correspondent for the Norwegian newspaper MORGEN BLADET and, on the whole my wages were quite sufficient for a publication with a small circulation. At that time, incidentally, the magazine was distributed for free. But with the growth in volume of GLASNOST, and the corresponding increase in the number of employees, this became insufficient. But it was just then that new possibilities appeared for us.

[Korolkova] Do you have in mind voluntary contributions?

[Grigoryants] Not that alone... Although, of course, a great number of people in the country are striving to support us. They organize picture exhibits and sales and present concerts for the cause of the GLASNOST fund.

But we have never printed any appeals on the necessity for donations, and as a matter of principle we do not accept contributions from those who have appealed to us for help—simply because someone might think that whatever it was we said about him was the result of his monetary contribution. And we take a cautious approach to contributions from abroad; for us they are sooner testimony of sympathy with the magazine than an item of income.

Our television service is a sounder and more reliable source of finance for us. I have already mentioned our group of operators. You see, for almost two years now the television service has been engaged in filming television news and video materials; moreover, in places where no one else is doing this. Not all that long ago they fired into a peaceful demonstration in Parkent—which is 34 km from Tashkent. The corrupt leadership there was trying to remain in power. People died. And our cassette was the only documentary evidence of the tragedy of that small town. We have filmed quite a few unique subjects—on the events in the Baltic, on the Easter services of the Ukrainian Catholic Church held in the woods, on the Sverdlovsk trial of defender-of-rights Sergey Kuznets—who is now once again a GLASNOST correspondent. We are now concluding official agreements with certain Western video firms and are beginning to shoot documentary films—news, ethnographic, and ecological films. The firms pay well. And, well, there are our own honoraria.

The magazine is operating at a loss for now; but, you see, the bulletin is quietly beginning to pay for itself. As far as the printing facilities are concerned, for now it is mostly at the planning stage. We have to be satisfied with not altogether clear agreements with small printing plants, sometimes in Moscow, sometimes in other cities. We have no concern about paper—that is the problem of those who print us. Our business—is to pay for the services.

[Korolkova] What is journalism to you—an end or a means?

[Grigoryants] I have an answer to that question which I have formulated for myself. I must admit that I have never had much sympathy for the "second oldest" profession; I still find it strange that I am editing a magazine, that I have several journalistic awards, including the "Golden Pen of Freedom" of the International Publishers' Society, and so on. Journalism has, indisputably, become my fate. But for me personally, it is nevertheless only a means. A means by which to reach a somewhat better life, so that free mankind does not know totalitarian, aggressively-archaic regimes, and so that the Declaration on the Rights of Man is not violated anywhere on the globe.

[Korolkova] Do you think it would be useful for the country and possibly for yourself, to have constructive dialogue on the basis of equals between the (for now) unofficial [neformalnyy] and the official [ofitsialnyy]

MEDIA AND JOURNALISM

JPRS-UPA-90-056
24 September 1990

press? Or is it more preferable for you to hold the position of principled confrontation? After all, in the magazine the open press is called none other than, "official," and in the "Press" section it catches hell on any pretext, especially the central publications...

[Grigoryants] For too long this dialogue could not be on the basis of equals and therefore did not make any sense: after all, an unequal dialogue is of no interest itself, and does not provide chances to explain the truth. Right now—if it would be a dialogue with honest people, and not with people who have adapted themselves or are seeking some kind of personal advantage—such a dialogue is entirely possible for us and even a natural outcome. In any rate, what we are doing is being done, as we believe, for the entire country. For its citizens, of all kinds—the good, the bad; those who have behaved better or worse in the past. All of us will one way or another exist in the new society.

[Korolkova] Do you intend to register GLASNOST in accordance with the Law on the Press?

[Grigoryants] Whyever not? We are absolutely not trying to complicate things for the sake of complication. Incidentally, we have already made such an attempt, but we were rejected. I admit, that we did not insist very strongly upon registration at that time; for it was completely obvious that after registration we would have to pay with the only thing we had—our independence and freedom. If such a price is not demanded of us now, then of course registration presents no problems whatsoever.

[Korolkova] Are you experiencing competition on the part of other unofficial publications? How do you evaluate their professional level? Do you think there is a danger of commercialization, indulging the lower tastes, if a crowd of fast operators surges into the press? What can one do to forestall this?

[Grigoryants] I don't think we are experiencing any particular competition. After all, no one besides us is publishing a "thick" socio-political monthly, since that is expensive, and no one has an operational information bulletin and video applications. On the other hand, I believe that competition is a useful thing in and of itself. And the fact that there exists, let's say, an EKSPRESS-KHRONIKA and an INFOVZGLYAD, is a great advantage, because that forces all three editions to work better. At the very same time the level of unofficial publications varies widely. Out of the approximately 1,000 such publications that exist at the present time, only a few dozen are really highly professional. The process of natural selection is operating. And that is the way it should be, by the way. The law on the Press will make the selection process even more stringent. And this process will inevitably touch the state press as well.

Well, commercialization is of course taking place. But here the danger is natural and healthy. That will happen anyway, and that means that we ourselves must not look dumb. Incidentally, commercial publications are often organized better than we, and it would do us no harm to

learn from them. Moreover, there will always be an audience for serious newspapers and magazines, for one cannot get along without them.

[Korolkova] And competition from the original "official" ["formalnyy"] publications does not bother you?

[Grigoryants] Certainly not; for us there was another problem when we thought that our publications would not meet the generally-accepted level. Now we no longer think that way, and in my opinion our commentary is in no way worse than that of NOVYY MIR. And in terms of efficiency, it is pretty hard to overtake us. And besides, our materials are more free.

[Korolkova] It seems to me that right now you are increasingly losing that advantage. Is the open press not reprinting your work?

[Grigoryants] And quite often at that. YUNOST, you see, found space for excerpts from the daily reports of Georgian journalist Naza Shamanura, who perished following forced "treatment" in a psychiatric hospital—they took reprisals upon her because she was courageous enough to write an essay about the crimes of the local authorities. URAL has recently taken certain of our materials... Many are simply using the GLASNOST bulletin, especially ATMODA and other Baltic newspapers.

[Korolkova] What is your professional creed?

[Grigoryants] As a member of the International Federation of Journalists, I receive information every month on how many of them pass away. The person who was awarded the Golden Pen of Freedom prize before me was recognized in it posthumously: He did not return from Lebanon. The secretary of our editorial office, Andrey Shilkov, was very nearly killed in Baku. The profession of journalism demands courage and devotion to one's duty. Therefore, paraphrasing Vittorio Strada, I would say: One must strive to live a life of freedom and dignity, never sacrificing either freedom nor dignity. And it remains for all of us to follow the precept of the Blessed Augustine: To pray as if everything depended only upon God; but to work as if everything depended only upon us.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda," "Zhurnalist," 1990

Changing Role of Media in Multiparty Conditions Explored

90US1272A Moscow ZHURNALIST in Russian No 6, Jun 90 pp 2-7

[Interview with V. Motyashov, CPSU Central Committee Ideology Department sector chief; I. Ilyin, PRAVDA party life department editor; G. Khatsenkov, deputy chairman of the organizing committee for creation of the People's Party of Russia; Professor V. Gorokhov, deputy head of the Social Sciences Academy

Mass Media Department under the CPSU Central Committee and doctor of philological sciences; and RSFSR People's Deputy L. Volkov, member of the Social-Democratic Association ispolkom and the SDA editorial council, conducted by ZHURNALIST editors N. Vaynonen, M. Cherednichenko, and S. Yakovlev: "The Press and the Party: A Current Interview"]

[Text] The birth of new political parties is one of the clear indications of development of the democratic process in the country. Judging by the acuteness of discussions between them, one thing remains undoubtedly clear to all sincere proponents of democracy and perestroyka: In order to emerge from the crisis, in order to renovate society on humane and democratic principles, it is vitally important to unite all the healthy forces of the country. And, on the other hand, the division and confrontation of these forces may be ruinous. Yet such unification would be immoral and simply unrealistic on the old foundation of ostentatious and ordered conformity of ideas. It must absorb the entire spectrum of equal opinions and legal interests in their constructive interaction and bring them closer to a national consensus.

There is no other option either for the party or for the country.

To facilitate such a turn of history, to help guide society away from the dangerous line, to direct it toward consensus and construction—this is how we see the civic duty of all our means of mass information, the task of the party conscience of journalists working in the press which belongs to the CPSU.

What must the press itself become like for this purpose? How must its relations be built with the country's renewed communist party and with other political forces?

The ZHURNALIST editorial staff poses questions to V. MOTYASHOV, CPSU Central Committee Ideology Department sector chief; A. ILYIN, member of the editorial board and PRAVDA party life section editor; G. KHATSENKO, deputy chairman of the organizing committee for creation of the People's Party of Russia; Professor V. GOROKHOV, CPSU Central Committee Social Sciences Academy Mass Media Department deputy head and doctor of philological sciences; and RSFSR People's Deputy L. VOLKOV, member of the Social-Democratic Association [SDA] ispolkom [executive committee] and the SDA editorial council.

From Dictate to Partnership

Vyacheslav MOTYASHOV, sector chief at the CPSU Central Committee Ideology Department.

[Editors] Up until recently, party management of the mass media was understood, essentially, as a dictate. In the discussions before the 28th CPSU Congress such a practice was decisively condemned. How correct is it to

speak of "management" when both the party and the press are changing, and when the multiparty system is becoming a reality?

[Motyashov] Let us begin with the fact that, in my firm conviction, the situation whereby the CPSU acted as the curator of all means of mass information was not beneficial primarily to the party itself. Why? Why, because in this case the party point of view lost clear delineation. Any individual opinion of a journalist or a specific group which was expressed in the press, on television or radio, seemed to have the blessing of the party apparatus. At times it was not easy for the readers, viewers, and listeners to discern what the party position really was. You may recall the case which was almost a textbook example with the article, "I Cannot Forgo My Principles".

Therefore, if we speak of management, it is that which, with significant stipulations which I will mention later, is permissible only in regard to the party press. That which is fully natural within the framework of the party, its principle relations, cannot be extended to nonparty publications. Let us say, the efforts of party committees to dictate their demands upon social trade union or youth publications are unacceptable. Yet I am sure that the party committees must drastically change their relations with the party press as well.

Anyone who wants to have an influence on the mass media should learn to do this not by force of an order, but by force of authority. I understand the new relations of the party organs with journalists not as relations of subordination and subservience, but as relations of partnership and cooperation. I believe that public opinion and various forms of public control will have much greater specific weight than they did before in correcting the work of the press. These may be in the form of public editorial councils with consultative functions, for example.

Nevertheless, of course, the CPSU, in instituting some of its press organs, does this to channel its political line through them. Therefore, I believe, first of all, that it is an absurdity when pluralism of opinions is understood as the omnivorous nature of one publication, and when they demand that this publication publish and give equal treatment to different, and sometimes even mutually exclusive, views and platforms. Secondly, I cannot understand the resentment of journalists who complain about the "repression of glasnost" in those cases when, while working in the publication of one party, they try to make it a tribune for opposing parties and forces.

Obviously, what I have said in no way refutes the need and possibility for appearance of discussion materials reflecting alternative viewpoints in any publication. We are speaking about the fact that "group affinities", and consequently also party affinities, are more than a natural thing for various press organs. True multiplicity may be ensured only thanks to an abundance of means of mass information which reflect different interests.

Yet here too we must try to avoid euphoria and illusion. The real state of affairs is such that the appearance of other parties de-jure still does not make them de facto influential political forces. Just as, we might add, the current abundance of "independent" publications does not mean that they come anywhere close to seriously competing with the "official" press. Evidently, considerable time will be needed before the multiparty structure really begins to work. During some transitional period, the resolution of numerous questions regarding the mass media will inevitably rest on the single-party structure mechanism currently in effect.

There are many questions directly affecting the press which cannot be resolved today without the party organs. These include funds, cadres, the organizational aspect of the matter, and coordination with interested departments and institutions on certain decisions. If the CPSU Central Committee does not do this today, then we do not know who will.

[Editors] A considerable part of the management functions which previously belonged to the CPSU are being handed over to the Soviets. This should probably also be reflected in the position of the press. How does it appear to you and what do you specifically think about the status of current newspapers which are at the same time organs both of the CPSU and the Soviets?

[Motyashov] The adoption of the Law on the Press, the transformation of the multiparty system into a political reality, and the ratification of the power of the Soviets already create a principally new situation for the CPSU. One of the confirmations of this fact is the cardinal change in the existing structure of the press, especially at the local level. In a number of cities the deputies of the new convocation not only demanded that the newspapers which are simultaneous organs of the party committees and the Soviets be handed over to the exclusive management of the Soviets, but also adopted the appropriate resolutions. There are cases when the editorial collectives themselves spoke out in favor of dividing a newspaper into a party and a soviet publication.

We understand that in the current very acute political situation it would not be of benefit either to the party or to perestroyka if the CPSU were deprived of a strong stratum of the local press which, we must say, often has greater influence in the region than the central press on the status of the political climate and on the formulation of public opinion. A most acute collision has occurred, whose resolution in the CPSU Central Committee proposes the following.

By agreement with the Soviets, to assume into the party budget the city and rayon newspapers which in their overwhelming majority are operating at a loss, or to publish them on a share basis with the Soviets. To create cost accounting regional party press concerns based at the oblast, kray, and republic newspapers and publications, including book publishers. If the Soviets pose the question of separation or of exclusive right to a certain

publication, it is most preferential, of course, for them to create their own new press organs. After all, the more publications there are and the more varied they are, the broader the possibilities for realization of glasnost and for meeting the informational needs of the people. There may also be a division, and if there are two or more joint publications, the transfer of one of them to the Soviets should also not be excluded, but this must be on a commercial basis.

As we can see, the party is ready to take on additional, and rather tangible, expenses. In practice, it is heading toward using its far from bottomless, as some try to convince the public, party coffers to subsidize the consolidation of the forces of perestroyka at today's critical boundary, and to protect glasnost and pluralism of opinions in each republic, kray, oblast and city. And such protection is needed. In order to become convinced of this, it is enough to cast our glance toward Lithuania. Here, in essence, they helped to conduct the most active separatist propaganda at party expense. The leaders of the independent CPL presented the Sayudist Supreme Soviet and the Council of Ministers with the republic party newspaper, which had been published in Russian since 1940.

Obviously, subsidizing newspapers places a great burden on the party budget. Therefore, it is necessary to bring these newspapers out of the breach, to increase their circulation, and this means to significantly improve their content. It is also important to sharply increase the advertising-commercial activity of the party press, especially that of the city and rayon newspapers. Today the lower party publications are permitted to devote up to 50 percent of their newspaper space to advertisements. And in order to really interest the editorial collectives, a high percentage of deductions from profits will go to the editorial funds, and the editorial collectives will have the right to spend this money as they see fit for their production and social needs.

With a rational approach to the commercial aspect of the matter, the contentual and ideological-moral instances will also not suffer. On the contrary, there is even an increased possibility of bringing the newspapers closer to the everyday needs and concerns of the people, and of increasing the humanity of the party press.

Let Respect for the Party Journalist Triumph

**Aleksandr ILYIN, member of the editorial board,
PRAVDA party life section editor.**

[Editors] At the threshold of the 28th CPSU Congress, every politically mature person understands that the fate of the party depends largely on whether or not it will be able to consolidate all the healthy forces of society around its platform. What role in this do you ascribe to the mass media?

[Ilyin] The mass media can play a key role in intensifying the processes of perestroyka. At one time they helped the progressive forces in the CPSU to get society moving, so

to speak, to bring it out of stagnation. This was recognized at the 27th Party Congress. Unfortunately, not all of us have understood that we cannot continually rock the boat, and by inertia we continued to "fight against..." and not "for". Say what you will, but you cannot build the framework of a building on negation of laws alone.

[Editors] The open letter by the CPSU Central Committee to communists evoked mixed reactions. These ranged from the almost jubilant exclamations: "Finally!", to complete rejection: "This is none other than an appeal to deal with those who do not agree with us in the spirit of the cultist and stagnant times". What is your evaluation of this document?

[Ilyin] I am far from believing that we have found an optimal means for emerging from the crisis situation in the party. There is a danger that this appeal may be used by conservative forces, that, as has been the case more than once, creative thinking people who speak out for radical renovation of the party and its cleansing will fall under the "delimitation". Yet let us not forget that today the party is not what it was before. And communists, at least a considerable part of them, have denounced the role of mindless executors of directives from above. They are themselves capable of figuring out what is what.

And the letter itself, as I understand it, is not a directive, but rather an appeal for thought, for consolidation on the principles which have been developed by perestroika, on the basis of its achievements—glasnost, democratization, pluralism of opinions, and freedom of discussion. We are speaking about a situation in which each communist may be defined in the complex sphere of a moral and political struggle. And here the role of the press, and especially radio and television, is great. In my opinion, they must be careful to avoid extremes, and most importantly—they must become not a loudspeaker in someone's hands, but a tribune for public opinion. They must facilitate the broad and free exchange of ideas and thoughts. At least we in PRAVDA and in our DISKUSIONNYY LISTOK strive specifically toward such dialogue. Let it be sharp, wounding someone's pride, yet—let it be a dialogue in which each person may express his point of view, hoping that he will be heard and understood. This initiative has received support in the CPSU Central Committee resolution entitled "On the newspaper PRAVDA".

[Editors] The multiparty system is literally, before our very eyes, turning from declaration to reality, as is the multiparty nature of the press. What problems of a professional and ideological character, in your opinion, will journalists encounter in this connection?

[Ilyin] Even quite recently they were afraid to say a word about the multiparty system in the press, and now... Some speak of this with irritation as before, others—almost with delight and rapture. Polarization of the press is taking place very quickly, literally before our very eyes. I am in favor of freedom of expressing one's views and freedom of choice. Whom you are with, what you speak

out for—that is a matter of each person's conscience. And this includes the journalist. Yet I cannot understand those who change their convictions like a pair of gloves. In my opinion, it is immoral to adapt one's views to the conditions of a certain situation. And I especially cannot understand when a person with a CPSU party card speaks out against his party. To rebuild it, to free it from the stereotypes of the past, to criticize its shortcomings—this is the position of a communist. But to "drill" the party from within, in essence to cross out its principles and ideals, such an approach is unacceptable for me. If someone considers this to be conservatism—so be it. It is easiest of all to paste a frightening label on one's opponent.

The multiparty system, undoubtedly, will demand new professional qualities of journalists. While before many of us eagerly resorted to such formulas as: Where was the gorkom, obkom, or Central Committee looking..., now this approach is useless. We must learn to convince the readers ourselves, without resorting to mediation by the organs of authority. We will have to learn to have a respectful attitude toward views which we, for example, do not share, and we will have to learn not to impose our own views. Yet we should also not hide our own position. We should not hide behind the "guise" of the newspaper or the journal.

[Editors] We are well aware of the vestiges of the situation where the newspaper was the organ of the kraykom, obkom, gorkom, etc., when it became essentially the newspaper of the apparatus, not reflecting the entire palette of opinions of the party masses and all the people. How can we most productively oppose this?

[Ilyin] I began working at PRAVDA in the press section, and the main theme of my own as well as other author's articles was the protection of journalists against the dictate of the apparatus, against efforts at reprisals for criticism. For example, early in 1976 we, together with our own PRAVDA correspondent in Azerbaijan, told about a blatant case of burning of the rayon newspaper in this republic. Who did not try to hinder the appearance of the article in PRAVDA! Yet it was printed. And serious measures were taken—toward the party workers, from the raykom all the way to the Azerbaijan CP Central Committee. Recalling this case, here is what I think about. Of course, it is good that a law protecting the right of journalists will be adopted. But even then much, if not all, will depend on the position of the journalist, on his principles, his courage, his conviction in his struggle for truth and human dignity.

[Editors] One of the clear manifestations of conservatism and dogmatism in thinking is the attitude toward journalists as mechanical executors and forced expressers of the party apparatus dictate. Yet can such "obedient" journalists really, creatively, with conviction, bring the party policy to life?

[Ilyin] I am convinced that in a newspaper or journal the main figure is not even the editor, but rather the journalist. He is a creative person. It sounds wrong when in an editorial collective they speak of chiefs and subordinates. Of course, any work requires clear-cut organization and discipline, but creativity recognizes only one hierarchical ladder—the level of giftedness and talent. Vera Tkachenko or Viktor Belousov never held any command positions, yet their sketches and journalistic articles are a decoration to any newspaper issue. Tanya Samolis worked with the mail in the letter department, but who could forget her famous (just that!) review "Purification", which evoked a stormy reaction before the 27th Party Congress, and at the Congress itself.

A journalist, if he is indeed a journalist by calling, cannot be either a "screw" or a "drive belt". Anyone who does not understand this, who tries to dictate his will to journalists—be he the editor or a party bureaucrat—that person simply does harm to our common cause. I hope that at the next party congress we will reach an understanding of the role of the press, and that respect for the party journalist will triumph.

Voice and Eye of the People

Georgiy KHATSENKOV, deputy chairman of the organizing committee for the creation of the People's Party of Russia.

[Editors] The multiparty system is a real fact of today's political life. How, in your opinion, must this be reflected in the mass media?

[Khatsenkov] Up until the present time there has been no serious constructive opposition to the ruling party in our country. This is the idea behind the People's Party of Russia which is currently being created. And we, who have had occasion to participate in its birth, of course, are pinning great hopes on the press. I see the relationship with it as being quite different from that which was dictated by the old political stamps.

Under conditions of a multiparty system and rejection of the CPSU's monopoly on power, the question of party management of the press, which has always worried journalists and our professional journal, must fade into the background and become an internal affair of the party itself, its relationship with its own, and only its own, press. Another question today stands in first place—how can journalists serve their people and facilitate the fullest possible and most truthful provision of information to society?

The complete stranglehold which was placed over the press had a tremendous deadening effect on the entire spiritual life of the country. The press was relegated to the role of ideological overseer. Yet it was the first to go out of control. The peculiarity of journalistic creativity (as well as of the work of the intelligentsia in general) consists of the fact that it cannot be reconciled with totalitarianism and suppression of the individual. Honor and glory today to those journalists who were the first to

recognize the inevitability of changes and began awakening the consciousness of the people. And it is no accident that bureaucrats today happily announce that it is supposedly the press which is at fault for the current troubles and crises, and not they, who placed the country on the brink of catastrophe. We must learn to distinguish appeals and slogans from political practice. In word, the partocracy rejects the command-bureaucratic "management" of the press. Yet in deed it strives to retain its "pocket" press at any cost, so it can continue to manipulate public consciousness. There are many examples of this, and they are well known to everyone.

What do I think is of primary importance today? We must not only announce, but also implement in practice the demonopolization of the mass media. Both on a moral-political and on a material-production level. The communist party must in deed reject its monopoly on truth. I believe that we must stop being blindly led by the positions of Lenin's article, "Party Organization and Party Literature" which was written at the beginning of the century in an entirely different historical and political situation, just as we must reject many other customary dogmas about the press. All of them speak of influence extending primarily in one direction—from the communist party to the masses: The press is the "drive belt" for "introducing into the consciousness" of workers the party theory and policy, which are supposedly the only correct ones. Yet both (in the past) have lost the credit of trust.

Today you will not force your opinion on anyone. Teachings and reprimands are not accepted. People are waiting for information, and further they say: We will make it out for ourselves. The notion that people with low level of literacy will not find the way themselves, without the help of irrefutable teaching, is irreversibly outdated. Society has grown up and does not want to be led by the hand into a bright tomorrow. In fact, can we not live, guided by natural all-human values and standards of morals, economics, law, and common sense attained through the experience of centuries and through objective science? Who needs our dead ideological stereotypes and mystifications, aside from those who live off of them? It is hopeless to try to artificially prolong their life. And the press must change from being an instrument of suggesting such-and-such to the people to an instrument of control by the people over politics and political leaders. Thus, the social role of the press and its position in society are radically changing.

Yet for this we must also de-monopolize the organizational structure and the material-technical base of the mass media. The question arises for the CPSU to divide this base with the Soviets and other political forces, to help them and their press get on their feet. This would be beneficial for the CPSU itself, and in its interests. Even Engels pointed out how important free criticism of party activity in a free press is for the communist party.

The communist party has been in a privileged position and did not pay taxes. Its publishing concerns have

brought in and continue to bring in huge profits. Who manages all this? If it is the 19 million communists as part of the people who manage it, then I believe the party masses would say: We must share it all with the people! The summer houses, resort cottages, special hospitals, typographic shops, and paper. Give it to the representatives of the people, its different strata and groups, its varied interests—political, economic, and national. Give them equal starting capacities for participating in politics. Central Radio and Television, evidently, must be handed over to the aegis of the USSR Supreme Soviet, while local broadcasting should be given to the local Soviets. Their leadership should be elected. And the CPSU, like the other parties, may have their own channel in return for payment, may buy air time, etc. This will be political pluralism. However, I believe that the state and the Soviets must now become monopolistic owners of TV and radio, not to mention the press. Not the state, but civic society itself—that is the primary owner of the mass media, expressing the full range of interests, attitudes and opinions existing within this society. Otherwise we will not create a legal state and will not have a reliable system of counterweights to maintain social equilibrium. The press is the voice of the people. The voice and the eye.

Pluralism and Independence—for the Sake of What?

Vladimir GOROKHOV, doctor of philological sciences

[Editors] The CPSU is criticized from the “right” for supposedly “letting the press get out of hand”, and on the contrary from the “left” for supposedly “firmly holding it by the hand”...

[Gorokhov] The press is respectfully called the “fourth power” (after the legislative, executive and judicial). Everyone wants this power to be just, prudent and effective.

The journalists also want this, when in response to the decision to replace the founder of the newspaper they organize a strike committee. The city soviet deputies want it too, when they take the television studio under their management and change the broadcasting network. The readers also want it, when they picket the editorial offices about an article they do not like.

For a long time the party held a monopoly on the mass media. Today the ideological and organizational monism of the press has exhausted itself. A new informational situation has emerged. Yet not everyone, including the party workers and journalists, have proved to be ready for it.

On one hand, there has been a clearly designated tendency toward growth of political independence of the journalist collectives. On the other—there has been a transition from the command-administrative methods of managing the press to political ones, based on the force of the law and the force of conviction, and this has given rise to new difficulties.

The activity of all the publishing houses (party ones are certainly no exception) takes place under conditions of contest, rivalry, and political and professional competition. Today one must work without hiding behind devalued ideological dogmas and build one's program of actions in strict accordance with the law.

Today we must speak of three levels of political management of the mass media:

- a) state regulation based on the Law on the Press,
- b) management of the press, radio and television by the founder and publisher;
- c) political orientation of the journalist collective stemming from the publication program and the principles of the editorial order.

The communist party not only overcomes administrative-command inertia associated with efforts to prohibit and suppress differences of opinion, but it also combats the liquidator position of a number of party committees which have become weakened or lost contact with the editorial offices. Coming to replace the authority of the office is the authority of the idea, when editorial offices are seeking intellectual political partners in the party committees, partners capable of enriching journalists with productive information. Generally speaking, the quality of the information treated in the dialogue of the party committee and editorial staff is the main indicator of their relations, the basis for interaction and trust.

[Editors] New informational publications, including the so-called alternative ones, are rapidly growing. What is the interaction of the CPSU with them?

[Gorokhov] Today the term “independent press” is popular. This term is convenient for designating the new status of the mass media which opposes the pressures of authoritarianism and totalitarianism. Yet this term is a conditional one, since an “independent press” does not exist in nature. The political engagement of the mass media is a universal regularity. And the question only centers around what policy lies at the basis of the editorial program, who specifically is the real (and not the disguised) subject of political management, whether in this case the party will win leadership positions and with what political forces it will form partnerships. Any publication depends on its founder, on the law, on the readers, on its commercial success, etc. Let us not flatter ourselves on this account.

It is another matter that the term “independent press” bears and even actualizes a new content, reflects a status of the mass media in civic society where the political consensus attained with the aid of the press makes it possible to hear the voice of the minority, to turn the mass media system into an instrument for fine-tuning public self-government, regardless of the ill will or political whim of some person or some group's egotistical interest. The CPSU adheres to just such principles. So there can be no question of any “hostility” in regard to

the "independent press" (and we still have occasion to hear such reproaches and fears). Free criticism, polemics, and exchange of views are another matter.

[Editors] Will the concept of communist party affinity be fruitful in building the new relations of the CPSU with its press?

[Gorokhov] On the eve of the 27th Party Congress the acuteness of the polemics, including also polemics surrounding the new role of the mass media, reached a particularly high pitch. I believe that this is the stage of opposition of opinions when a new conception of the mass media, a new conception of its management, must inevitably be crystallized. The kernel of this conception will be, in my opinion, the idea of democratic inclusion of the party into the system of political, economic, and legal relations regulating the activity of the press. The party cannot affirm itself by resolutions and instructions alone. It will fight for those laws, for those economic relations, for those forms of political life which will allow it to raise its voice on the basis of a mandate of trust from the masses, to build a new structure of publications and to strengthen its ties with its audience.

In turn, the dispersion of forces on the political arena will force many party publications to assume more clear-cut positions. Pluralism of opinions, of which we are so proud today, is not infinite. It has limits, which are associated with the answer to the question: Pluralism—for the sake of what? For the sake of political ambitions or for the sake of a constructive solution? For the sake of mental exercise or for the sake of a search for truth? For the sake of defending selfish interests or for the sake of affirming social justice?

Communist party affinity—under conditions of a multi-party system, under conditions of democratic choice—will more fully expose its creative nature, will announce itself as an open system of views capable of perceiving and evaluating important information, organically combining "constructive stability" of fundamental ideas with the dynamics of renewal.

Recently I have encountered certain members of the CPSU (I intentionally do not call them communists) who in the period of revolutionary breakdown of society quickly paint themselves in the most varied colors of the political spectrum. If we speak of the interaction between the party and the press, then—thank God!—today it is no longer profitable to be a communist in the domestic, everyday sense. This situation will help to clean the dead barnacles off of the bottom of our ship. People of conviction will remain in the party publications, and will return to some others. They will create journalism of the Leninist type, free of any selfishness, protecting the interests of the workers, and affirming the real values of renewed socialism.

What Will We Take to Market?

Leonid VOLKOV, member of the Social Democratic Association ispolkom and the SDA editorial council, RSFSR people's deputy.

[Editors] The Social-Democratic Association has been in existence for about a year. The constituent congress of the Social-Democratic Party of Russia was held in the first days of May. How have your relations with the press been up to this point? Are you satisfied with how the activity of the social-democrats is being illuminated today in the newspapers and other means of mass information?

[Volkov] The measures conducted by the social-democrats were often attended by representatives of the periodical publications—most often KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, SOBESEDNIK, MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI, ARGUMENTY I FAKTY, MOSKOVSKIY KOMSOMOLETS, and the new newspaper KOMMERSANT... The most important events, as for example the Tallinn Congress of the association held in the summer of last year, was illuminated also in other publications, as for example LITERATURNAYA GAZETA. Our materials are regularly published by the Baltic press: SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA, MOLODEZH ESTONIYI, and ATMODA. The regional and city newspapers also write about social democracy. So that we do feel attention toward ourselves. It is another matter what kinds of materials are printed, and what attitude is expressed toward us in these publications.

KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, for example, has run the most varied articles, including some that distorted the goals, intentions, and practice of social democracy. In one of its publications it affirmed that the SDA has set the primary goal of taking cooperatives under its wing, thereby relieving them of taxes. It would be understandable if SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA had spoken out in this manner, but here?

PRAVDA and IZVESTIYA are keeping silent for the time being. It seems that they have not yet defined themselves in relation to social democracy.

There are several informal publications which show particular interest and affinity toward the social democratic movement. For example, ESDEK and NOVAYA ZHIZN. I must emphasize that they are not newspapers of the social democratic association.

[Editors] Do you have any desire to take these newspaper in hand? After all, the party will one way or another have to resolve the question of its own press. It will need a branched network of publications, as well as a central press organ, probably...

[Volkov] The SDA newspaper will be created on the polygraphic base of the newspaper MOSKOVSKIY UNIVERSITET. As yet these efforts have not been crowned with success. There is no paper. Our journal is in a more advanced state, I would say. It will be called

FORUM, and will in no case be narrowly party oriented. It will be a socio-political journal illuminating various aspects of our life from social democratic viewpoints. The journal is to be published bimonthly with a circulation of 25,000 copies and a volume of six printed pages. Two issues have already been prepared and await issuance. The journal promises to be quite interesting. It publishes prose, even poetry, philosophical publicistics, and it will also have theoretical articles. Among the first authors I will name G. Pomerants, V. Sheynis, and Ya. Berger—the authors, you understand, do not necessarily have to be social democrats. In general, in our social democracy today there is more liberal than socialist—this is a social democracy not of the 19th, but of the late 20th Century.

Here we must mention our principle tenet: We want the social democratic press to be independent, so that the newspapers are not, strictly speaking, party organs, and are not subordinate to party management. On the contrary, party leaders must not control the press which, quite probably, will have to criticize them.

Our main dream is to create a large independent newspaper by ourselves or in conjunction with other movements similar in spirit. A newspaper which is comparable to other large international publications such as LIBERACION or LE MONDE in France, or UNITA in Italy. Yet it must specifically be a newspaper (which will contain information from various spheres of life, reports, publicistics), and not simply a mouthpiece for the political ideology of the party.

[Editors] Does this not contradict the common understanding of the role of the party press? We all remember from our school days that a party newspaper must be a collective organizer. As far as we know from your speeches, you see the social democratic party as not being too much of a mass party and do not want populist ideas to penetrate into it. If your newspaper does not try to attract as many people as possible to its side, then what is its political role?

[Volkov] Thoughts about a newspaper-organizer, by the way, were expressed not only by Russian social democrats. This was discussed at various times by the representatives of various parties. In fact, many parties have been formed around newspapers. For example, the Conservative and Liberal parties in England—this was back in the 18th Century!

The role of the press in party activity remains significant even today. However, we really do not want to create either a mass or an ideological party. A mass party in the sense that it must, first of all, subordinate itself to millions of its members, tied by discipline, and secondly—demand from them a view of things not from the standpoint of common sense and real life, but rather a view through some ideological prism, which distorts this life to the benefit of the party leaders.

A pluralist society finds the line of its behavior depending on the changing historical, economic, and

social situation with the aid of a pendulum mechanism, which is specifically formed by parties. Parties are indicators of what is going on in society. In the current world there are generally few ideological parties which would want to inevitably build a different society. Let us take the programs of most of the parties of the Western countries—they seem very similar. I might add that the popularity of the socialists in the West has somewhat declined specifically because, in my opinion, their programs contain comparatively too much ideology. Most of the current parties are distinguished from each other by traditions, style, method of thinking, that is to say their mentality, but not by ideology.

Two or three parties are enough for a normally functioning society in order to fulfill the "equalizing" role. We still have a long way to go to this point.

What I have been talking about is called the political market. Any party is primarily a "trader" on the political market. It offers the "buyer" (voter) its "goods", its approaches to the solution of certain pressing problems. The parties conduct "trade" not only with the electors, but also among themselves. Wherever there is such a political market, there is also the hope of solving all problems without bloodshed. Yet when, in order to do something, it is necessary to win millions of propaganda-confused minds over to one's side—that is a beggar's policy in the absence of a political market. If you have quality goods, you will not go bankrupt: If they did not buy today, they will surely buy tomorrow...

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda," "Zhurnalist," 1990

Chairman Details Formation of Independent Georgian Journalists' Union

90US1273A Moscow ZHURNALIST in Russian No 6, Jun 90 pp 30-32

[Interview with Nikolay Georgiyevich Cherkezishvili, head of the Georgian Journalists' Union, conducted by Irina Inoveli: "Nikolay Cherkezishvili: 'We've Left Behind the Condition of Having No Rights"'; date and place of interview not given]

[Text] A few words about our interlocutors. Irina Inoveli graduated from the Leningrad State Institute of Culture. She worked on the newspapers MOLODOY TSELINNIK, LENINSKAYA SMENA (Kazakhstan), and MOLODEZH GRUZII. For the past 17 years she has been a special correspondent and commentator for ZARYA VOSTOKA. She is a Georgian SSR honored journalist. At the request of ZHURNALIST, she interviewed N. G. Cherkezishvili, leader of the Georgian Journalists' Union.

Nikolay Georgiyevich Cherkezishvili graduated from the Moscow Institute of International relations in the early 1950s with the specialty of jurist. Returning to Georgia, he joined the editorial staff of the newspaper ZARYA VOSTOKA. He soon moved to work on the Georgian

Communist Party Central Committee as an instructor in the Propaganda Department, then as deputy chief of the department, then as chief of the Department of Science and Culture. Coming out against party ideological dogmatism and corruption, however, he fell into disgrace in the mid-1960s. When a leadership change occurred in Georgia in the early 1970s, Cherkezishvili was again invited to serve on the Central Committee, where he became head of the Culture Department. After that he worked for 20 years as editor of ZARYA VOSTOKA. Lately he has been in charge of the republic newspaper KOMUNIST, while simultaneously heading the board of the Georgian Journalists' Union. Here it is necessary to be more precise—the old Journalists' Union. Because—but here the interview itself begins.

[Inoveli] On 11 March, when the special congress of the Georgian Journalists was held, the foundation was laid for a fundamentally new professional society, and a different union, unlike the former one, was born, although it will probably take the passage of a certain amount of time before we can really believe that. And so, what can you say about the newborn?

[Cherkezishvili] The newborn came into the world without any complications; it is healthy, energetic, and developing confidently. Well, in all seriousness, I would like to first say a few words about what sort of model of journalists' union we previously had in operation—not just in Georgia but in the country as a whole—and what we have left behind, never again, I hope, to return to it.

Not very long ago the basic nucleus of the members of the Journalists' Union worked on the party press. Editors were members of the corresponding party committees. Thus, the board of the Journalists' Union consisted essentially of party functionaries, and all its work was based on directives from the Central Committee Propaganda Department. Such a practice turned the Journalists' Union not into a professional society of independent journalists, which it should in fact be, but, for all intents and purposes, into yet another department of the party committee. But a kind of second-class department at that, since its functions were rather curtailed. Your recall—congresses of the Journalists' Union were held “at the level,” as we used to say, of the secretary for ideology, and its entire work took place under the party committee's diktat. So is it any wonder that until recently the Journalists' Union never once came to the defense of a single persecuted journalist? In any event, in my memory such a thing never happened, and I have been a member of the USSR Journalists' Union since 1958. And only today are we hearing rumors of such attempts, albeit unsuccessful ones, but nonetheless attempts! It is significant that these attempts arose simultaneously with the awareness of the necessity and inevitability of a fundamental restructuring of the USSR Journalists' Union. It would be difficult to overestimate the importance for our republic's journalists of the 11 March birth of the independent Georgian Journalists' Union. The special congress was exceptionally representative: more than 300 delegates and more than 100

invited guests took part in it. For the first time a chairman of the board was elected who was freed of other duties. As you know, I quit my position as editor of KOMUNIST as soon as I was elected. For the first time, the chairman and three secretaries, who were also freed of other duties, were elected directly by the congress, rather than by the board, as was previously the practice. And the board itself was reduced from 130 to 50 members, which, let us hope, will give it greater mobility. The congress chose the chairman in a contested election from among three candidates. I will not hide the fact that I am proud to have been elected by an overwhelming majority of votes—only five delegates voted against me, and six abstained.

A Charter of the Georgian Journalists' Union was adopted at the congress. It states, in part: “The Georgian Journalists' Union (GJU) is a free, independent and voluntary professional creative association of journalists. A citizen of any nationality and faith who accepts its charter can be a member of the GJU . . . the GJU cooperates with existing journalists' associations in the republic, the USSR, and beyond the borders of the Soviet Union.”

[Inoveli] does membership in the GJU automatically mean withdrawal from the USSR Journalists' Union?

[Cherkezishvili] Of course not. Any member of our republic union can also remain a member of the USSR Journalists' Union and become a member of any journalists' organization. We do not restrict freedom of choice. There is only one requirement: A member of the GJU must observe its charter and the norms of professional ethics and engage in active journalistic work. The status of member of the GJU is retained by retired journalists who have had at least 20 years of professional service.

[Inoveli] The newspaper IZVESTIYA for 2 April carried a report about what the new USSR Journalists' Union that is to be established in the summer and early autumn at our professional congress should be like. It is being proposed that it be based on the principle of confederation. Do you like that idea?

[Cherkezishvili] That is precisely the idea that I presented at the meeting of the Presidium of the Board of the USSR Journalists' Union that was held this February. There was discussion at the time of whether the board in its previous form could continue to function not so much in a renewed professional union but, for all intents and purposes, in a completely new one. There was also discussion of what that union should be like. I spoke at the time for a confederal structure of the country's Journalists' Union.

As for the board's former personnel. Well, that same meeting of the Presidium of the Board of the USSR Journalists' Union that I have been talking about discussed a MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI article by Nikolay Burym, one of the released secretaries of the country's

present Journalists' Union. I myself could have subscribed to everything that he wrote. But the issue lies elsewhere: the article's author had no moral right to say what he said, primarily because he himself had done nothing to promote innovative, progressive work by the USSR Journalists' Union. To the contrary: through his work style, he himself had contributed to the bureaucratic, dogmatic approaches that had become firmly established there, which is what ultimately made the Journalists' Union the odious body that it had become.

You were a witness to how, when an enormous disaster happened to us in Georgia last 9 April, many central media outlets, especially in the initial stages, either kept the events quiet or, even worse, tried to distort them. Something had to be done, and promptly. At the time, as the head of the republic Journalists' Union, I flew to Moscow together with other representatives of Georgia's intelligentsia with the intention of holding a press conference here for my colleagues from the central mass media, that is, with the intention of speaking the whole truth about the events of 9 April. And what happened? The leadership of the USSR Journalists' Union not only did not want to help us out by providing a facility, it refused on principle to assist us in any way at all. Granted, we held the press conference all the same, in the Georgian Mziuri Cultural Center on the Arbat, and it had a great impact. Can the country's journalists accept such a state of affairs, in which the Journalists' Union's central agencies totally distance themselves from such a problematical political event?

[Inovelj] Your words make it generally clear what sort of model of a Journalists' Union you actively reject. At present the republic's journalists have undertaken, under your leadership, to implement the idea of a fundamentally different professional and creative association of our fraternity. I wish you would tell in greater detail how you see our union in a genuinely democratic state. I would also like to know your opinion concerning such an absurdity, which existed for decades, as dual membership in trade unions of workers in the creative professions. After all, while being—like actors, artists, musicians and other representatives of the creative professions—members of the Cultural Workers' Trade Union, journalists were simultaneously also members of their very "own" union, the Journalists' Union. Naturally, they had to pay trade union dues twice. It is understandable that the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions and the leadership of the creative unions found that system to their liking. However, although it seems utter nonsense, it actually existed!

[Cherkezishvili] In my view a person, a worker, should have one trade union. And the money from its members' dues should be accumulated only in one place. Incidentally, until this year six percent of all the income received by Georgia's journalists' through the All-Union Copyright Agency went into the coffers of the USSR Journalists' Union. And yet the republic's journalists got nothing from there: that money (and it was a considerable sum) was not returned to us in any form. Now that

money remains with us, which has already made it possible for us to establish, starting this year, a pension for journalists as a supplement to their state pension. So far it is 50 rubles a month. At present, journalists who have worked at least 20 years on the mass media and who retire from a job with the media have the right to such pensions.

And now let us return to the beginning of your question. When we started thinking more than two years ago about what sort of Journalists' Union we needed, we reached the unequivocal decision: anything but the sort whose entire activity comes down to the mechanical registration of processes in the mass media, or to the mechanically understood professional training of personnel. I am convinced that that is the concern of other "institutions"—the qualifications and professional level of associates. The training of journalists for the republic is the job of Tbilisi State University imeni Ivane Dzhavakhishvili, which recently acquired autonomy and, I believe, will not tolerate anyone's interference in the realm of its independent activities. However, that does not rule out business contacts between the journalism division and our union in the future.

I may be asked: But if the conducting of various seminars, courses and other "activities" is not what should constitute the essence of the Journalists' Union's activities, what should? I will answer: Its chief purpose is to provide truthful information to journalists about events that are occurring in the republic and the country, thereby helping them to correctly orient themselves. Our union also should engage in defending journalists' professional interests and rights, and satisfy their social requirements. One of its main tasks is to work with young journalists and students in the journalism division. That includes providing supplementary stipends from the funds of the GJU, and giving them practical experience on the staffs of the best publications in our country and abroad. We need to train independent journalists who will serve only the truth. After all, all of us people of the older generations have to one degree or another been warped by our existing system of developing journalists.

We are now moving toward a multiparty system. Of course, I do not mean multiparty confusion, whereby there are dozens of parties in the republic. In a multiparty system, when the mass media acquire true independence, the Journalists' Union will be a connecting link between editorial boards and their employees. We are also open for cooperation with other journalists' associations, if any emerge in the republic.

At our congress in March we elected a Council for Professional Ethics and Journalists' Rights, which is headed by the well-known legal specialist Tedo Ninidze, editor of the SABCHOTA SAMARTALI law journal. This council is not subordinate to the union's chairman and secretariat; it is accountable only to the congress. At

the congress we adopted a Code of Professional Ethics and Journalists' Rights, by which the council will be guided in its work.

[Inovel] Last year's well-known events, which stemmed from the exacerbation of internationality relations within the republic, also affected relations among journalists. After all, you won't try to deny that a certain confrontation exists between the GJU and the journalistic collectives in the Abkhaz ASSR and the South Ossetian Autonomous Oblast that work in those formations' national languages?

[Cherkezishvili] Unfortunately, that is true. A certain misunderstanding between us can and should be eliminated through common meetings and searches for new forms of cooperation. There is no other way to mutual understanding. I am planning trips to Sukhumi and Tskhinvali, and the released secretaries of the GJU will also visit there. I hope that we will be able to find a common language with the journalists of Abkhazia and South Ossetia. More precisely, with part of those autonomous entities' journalist corps, with those who work on Abkhaz and Osetian publications. Because we have close relations with our colleagues who put out publications in Georgian there.

[Inovel] I cannot help asking you this question: Under a multiparty system, how will the GJU "cope" with the rayon and city newspapers, if they all continue to be organs of the corresponding committees of the Georgian Communist Party?

[Cherkezishvili] We are presently working out our concept of the structure of the republic press. According to it, at the city and rayon levels there would not only be the "party" newspapers. And another fundamental point: any newspaper should be profitable.

[Inovel] What does the GJU intend to do to promote the more rapid emergence in the republic of genuinely independent publications, as well as to prevent the Georgian- and Russian-language press from resembling noncommunicating vessels, as has often been the case up until now?

[Cherkezishvili] At the first expanded meeting of the Secretariat of the Georgian Journalists' Union after the congress, held on the eve of the anniversary of the 9 April events and devoted to that topic, it was noted that over the past year most of the republic's mass media have become more truthful and bolder. But there are still many problems. After all, even we ourselves do not always speak the truth (I have in mind certain articles in republic publications), and it is sometimes not spoken about us. Let me cite the following example: in March a Yugoslav newspaper carried a piece of disinformation about an act of vandalism supposedly committed in Tbilisi—the destruction of a monument to Lenin on Tbilisi's central square. And although it never happened, the disinformation was circulated, and some central newspapers "contrived" to publish that note or their own reports without verifying it through their staff

correspondents in Georgia. I think that there is no need particularly to describe what sort of reaction that drew from us in the republic. The situation is difficult to start with, and here someone else pours oil on the fire, clearly trying to provoke undesirable excesses. And so, the expanded meeting of the Secretariat of the Journalists' Union that I have already mentioned discussed that issue too. It was decided that, in addition to an independent Georgian Newspaper, which the GJU intends to publish in the near future, we also need to establish a free Russian-language newspaper under our union; it would give assessments of all possible disinformation about events in the republic, wherever that disinformation appeared. In addition, such a newspaper would be a connecting link that would help the republic's Russian-speaking inhabitants to better find out about and, hence, better understand the processes occurring in the republic. It is entirely possible that such a newspaper would also carry a kind of digest of translations of the most interesting materials from the Georgian-language press.

[Inovel] And one last question: What sort of ties does the GJU have in the country and abroad?

[Cherkezishvili] We intend to build our relations with both the USSR Journalists' Union and the journalists' unions of the other union republics on a contractual basis and the principles of parity. We are planning both creative and economic ties. We would like to have our own publishing facilities, and we are seriously thinking about that. It is perfectly obvious that TASS is not coping with the duties of providing objective, unbiased information. Some thought must be given to establishing wire services in the republics that would be linked directly with one another for the exchange of information. The same thing could also be done by economically independent large newspapers. We also intend to establish direct relations with the wire services of foreign countries. We are thinking about the possibility of having independent newspapers under the GJU published in three languages—Georgian, Russian and English. In short, our union intends to have direct ties with journalists' associations from other countries of the world. Now, a word about how we are planning to strengthen our economic base. In 1988 we established contacts with the well-known American company [Ceibi] Corporation. Its head, the businessman David [Ceibi] and the GJU leadership believe that the contract concluded between us for the establishment of a Tbilisi-Seattle Joint Venture is advantageous to both sides. That enterprise will produce both high-quality printed products, which I have already mentioned, and other goods, which will make it possible for us, in time, to have our own hard currency. Already this year, at our initiative, a contract has been concluded between Gonzaga University in the United States and Tbilisi State University imeni Ivane Dzhavakhishvili that provides for the exchange of students and instructors, including those in the journalism division. We also have ties with journalists in Israel, and contacts are being set up with colleagues from Turkey. As you know, there are a good

number of emigrants from Georgia living in Israel, and the newspaper ALIYA SAKARTVELODAN is published in Georgian there. Israeli journalists have already visited us twice, and we visited Israel in January at their invitation, concluding mutually beneficial contracts. In short, our ties on the international level are growing stronger and expanding.

[Inovel] Well, it remains to wish our union success. Let's hope that the republic's journalists will feel better—more confident, protected, and open to truth and creativity. Thank you for the interview.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda," "Zhurnalist," 1990

'Memorial' Group Uncovers Mass Grave Near Yaroslavl

90UN2516A Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA
in Russian No 30, 28 Jul 90 p 2

[Article by V. Ionov: "Thirty of [19]37...."]

[Text] The place of execution was preserved by the memory of the people. And the time was determined by the remains of clothing and footwear extracted from the burial ground. On one perfectly unworn galosh, produced by the Leningrad Krasnyy Treugolnik Factory, the date of production is distinctly readable: 1937. The method of execution is indicated by the pistol bullets stuck in some of the skulls.

Another burial ground of the victims of Stalinism has been brought to light. In a forest behind the village of Selifontovo, which is several kilometers from Yaroslavl, members of the local division of the "Memorial" Society found the remains of approximately 30 men and women executed here.

At first the oblast organs of the KGB and internal affairs refused to confirm the information received by "Memorial" on the secrets of the Selifontovo Forest. They even prohibited the detachment of Valeriy Gorobchenko from making excavations. Only after the submission of indisputable evidence of the existence of the burial ground, the oblispolkom joined in the search.

But here is a paradox. Now no one knows where to put the remains. The official authorities have no objections

to leave them there, having crowned them with a grave-stone. They propose to transfer the remains to one of the churches in the center of Yaroslavl, where plaques are to be established with the names of the people who were innocently killed. An impressive plan exists already. But quite a lot of funds and time are required for its realization.

But for the time being there is a proceeding in the case, the public is asking for a section to be set aside for the now functioning city cemetery and to conduct a reburial there.

But by far not all wish this. And for this reason, "Memorial" once again does not find support, including in the search for other burial places, although there were 35 camps in the territory of Yaroslavl.

No enthusiasm is called forth by the aspiration of "Memorial" to restore the names of those who perished innocently. "This is improbably difficult," people answer who are experienced in it, evidently not without fear of the fact that after the names of the tortured and shot someone will get the idea of raising from the secret hiding-places the names of the torturers as well.

But the difficulties do not intimidate all. V. Gorobchenko has already, it seems, found the key to the deciphering of the list of those buried in the Selifontovo Forest. Among the skulls discovered there, one, judging by the dimensions, may belong to a woman of very small stature. And there is evidence that precisely such a woman was shot in a group of 32 people in October 1937. It remains only to conjecture when the organs will join in the search in whose safes there are still quite a few documents that are not known to the public.

New Lithuanian Publication on Environment

90P50104A Vilnius TIESA in Lithuanian 8 Sep 90 p 6

[Report by Aleksandras Kezys under the rubric "New Publications": "SOS, We Congratulate You!"]

[Text] Lithuania should know everything about the environment in which we live. "SOS will provide information on construction projects for new facilities, interview experts on the environment, publicize their research results, write about the experience of other countries in the area of the environment," this is how the editors of the new, fortnightly newspaper are introducing it to readers, stressing that this publication is not only for ecologists.

This new newspaper is not only surprising, but also gratifying. When we see old, yellowed stacks of ZALIOJI LIETUVA [GREEN LITHUANIA] or TEVISKES GAMTA [NATURE OF OUR NATIVE LAND] at the kiosks, we wonder if the same fate won't befall SOS. On the other hand, this first issue leads one to think that perhaps people will be eager to see the paper and will ask for it, if the editors avail themselves of the information, readers' facts and ideas which are sent in to its publisher, the Environmental Protection Department of the Republic of Lithuania.

So, good luck, SOS.

State Environmental Expenditures Summarized

90WN0256A Moscow EKONOMIKA I ZHIZN
in Russian No 31, Jul 90 p 14

[Response to a letter by N. Artemov: "More Money, Lower Returns"]

[Text] "Can you say how much is allocated for environmental protection and how it is used?"

N. Artemov Arkhangelsk

For water resources an average of 1,617,000,000 rubles was invested each year during the past five-year plan, for the current five-year plan the figure is 1,989,000,000 rubles. Additional money went to protect the atmosphere—here the growth was from 180 to 314 million rubles. However, the return from these increasing amounts has not improved, but has declined.

Thus, the average annual indicator for the introduction of waste water treatment facilities remains at the level of the past five-year plan—capacity for 5.4 million cubic meters daily. Fewer water recycling systems were introduced than during the past five-year plan—their capacity totaled 21.5 million cubic meters daily, compared to 24.4 million for the previous five-year plan. There was also a decline in the average annual introduction of facilities for removing and processing pollutants from exhaust gases—from a capacity for 40 million cubic meters of gas per hour it declined to 36 million.

This is not surprising. During 1986-1989 the targets for installing waste water treatment facilities were only 50-69 percent fulfilled; those for water recycling facilities—52-84 percent fulfilled; and for removing and processing air pollutants—56-81 percent.

State Capital Investments For Environmental Protection and Rational Use of Natural Resources (in comparable prices; millions of rubles)

	Annual Average		
	1976-1980	1961-1985	1986-1989
Total	2,165	2,224	2,914
Including			
For the protection and rational use of water resources	1,668	1,617	1,989
For the protection of the atmosphere	190	180	314

Introduction of Capacity for Air and Water Pollution Control

	Annual Average		
	1976-1980	1961-1985	1986-1989
Waste water treatment facilities, millions of m ³ per day	7.4	5.4	5.4
Water recycling systems, millions of m ³ per day	24.3	24.4	21.5
Facilities for removing and processing pollutants from exhaust gases millions of m ³ of gas per hour	34.5	40.0	36.0

Activist Updates Efforts To Clean Up Kazakhstan's Lake Balkhash

90WN0256B Alma-Ata KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 28 Jul 90 p 3

[Interview with Anuar Alimzhanov by M. Makulbekov: "Lake Balkhash: An Optimistic Tragedy"]

[Text] A lake is in trouble. It is getting shallower and more polluted. Ecologists and inhabitants of the area

around Lake Balkhash are concerned. This uneasiness about the fate of Lake Balkhash has been expressed in newspapers and on television. Even the academic publication "Geograficheskiy entsiklopedicheskiy slovar" [Encyclopedic Dictionary of Geography] warns: "An increase in water withdrawals for irrigation systems in the Ili River basin threatens to increase salinity and reduce water levels..."

Writers and public organizations in the republic have joined the struggle to save the lake. For two years in a

now there have been round table meetings in Alma-Ata at the initiative of the Kazakh Committee for the Protection of the World. The participants at the last meeting—writers and scientists from various countries, adherents of the International Baykal Movement—decided to declare Lakes Balkhash and Biwa (Japan) unique. Among their siblings are bodies of water such as the Aral Sea, Lake Baykal, Sevan, and Khubsugul.

In the final document of the round table, which was published in KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA on 23 July 1989, writers from Japan, the United States, Mongolia, and the USSR called upon intellectuals from all countries to struggle together to save rivers and lakes. What has been done since then? Did the alarm sounded by the literati have an effect upon Lake Balkhash? These and other questions are answered by the writer Anuar Alimzhanov, chairman of the Kazakh Committee for the Protection of the World, a Kazakh SSR people's deputy and winner of the J. Nehru Prize and the People's Republic of the Congo Prize.

[M. Makulbekov] Anuar Turlybekovich, make it clear to us right away why the Committee for the Protection of the World is engaged in ecological problems.

[Anuar Alimzhanov] The word "World" has many meanings. While in the recent past the main threat to humanity was the stand off between NATO and the Warsaw Pact, today, when the thinking of politicians and peoples has been demilitarized, the greatest danger comes from various ecological catastrophes taking place before our very eyes. These include rising atmospheric temperatures due to the greenhouse effect caused by increased carbon dioxide; the death of the Aral Sea, Chernobyl and the dried up nameless little stream that was the only nesting place for various rare birds. Nature is one, and therefore ecological calamities do not recognize administrative and state boundaries. So, today the struggle for the world is primarily the struggle for everything living on earth. In attempting to help Lake Balkhash our committee is engaged in a matter which concerns it directly.

[M. Makulbekov] What, in your opinion, must be done to save Lake Balkhash?

[Anuar Alimzhanov] Science and exact knowledge are needed. Unfortunately, today we are limited to meetings and appeals. Emotions undermine arguments. What if, under pressure from public opinion, the government decided to help Lake Balkhash? What could be done and where to begin? Not a single scientific institution in Kazakhstan has comprehensive data on Lake Balkhash. How badly is it polluted; what is the composition of the water in rivers flowing into it? There is a long list of such unanswered questions. I will give one fact to illustrate our unenlightened thickheadedness and the degree to which we have fallen out of civilized world society. Can you imagine a map of the USSR with only one blue spot—Lake Baykal? Wouldn't that be strange? However,

to our shame, there is such a map. It is in the encyclopedia "Ozera mira" [Lakes of the World]. This book does not include the Aral Sea, Lake Balkhash, Kur-galdzhino, Ladoga or other bodies of water. This is because nobody has seriously studied them. But as for Lake Baykal—every cloud has a silver lining. In saving that lake from pollution and death, Valentin Rasputin and other writers challenged powerful all-union agencies that are destroying nature without even thinking about it. The problem of Baykal attracted the attention of the public and of scientists. An institute was created. It is now studying the lake's history, flora and fauna. A huge amount of work has been done by G. I. Galazi, doctor of biology, correspondent member of the USSR Academy of Sciences and a very prominent Soviet ecologist. He has written several books about Lake Baykal that summarize data from numerous studies and from other sources. This made it possible to include the lake in the encyclopedia.

Here in our republic we do not have a single limnology institute, even though Kazakhstan can truly be called the republic of lakes. There is no such institute in the entire country.

Incidentally, everybody knows that the reserves of fresh water on the planet are declining from year to year. The UN has even declared the current decade to be the "Drinking Water Decade", allocating huge sums to protect the purity of water sources on various continents. Under these conditions, where rivers and lakes in our country are being senselessly polluted, where springs are drying up, there is only one water research institute functioning in the USSR; it is somewhere near Kharkov.

[M. Makulbekov] Let us return to the problem of Lake Balkhash. Have there been changes?

[Anuar Alimzhanov] From 7 to 15 July of this year a group of Japanese scientists worked in Kazakhstan. They came at the invitation of the Kazakh Committee for the Protection of the World and did a great deal of work at Balkhash and the Aral Sea. I stress that they came at their own expense, with their own equipment. We do not have such items. Norio Osida, Iosihiro Fukushima and Kazio Nisimura are scientists from Kyoto University. They are senior associates at the Limnology Institute at Lake Biwa. Sashiko Vasida, a journalist covering ecological issues, worked with them. They took many samples of the shore and bottom, and of water from Balkhash, Kapchagay, the Lepsy, Aksu and other rivers flowing into the lake. They flew by helicopter to the most inaccessible places. In short, they worked unstintingly. This is their attitude towards their work and towards life. Later we went to the Aral Sea. In three days we flew almost completely around it and visited Barsa-Kelmes Island.

The Japanese themselves expect much from this expedition. They took their samples with them and are now studying them. They will give us the results from their studies and their recommendations. Also, the study of

Lake Balkhash and the Aral Sea will make it possible to include them in the encyclopedia "Lakes of the World." This means that the calamities around Lake Balkhash and the Aral Sea will attract the attention of ecologists from other countries. Obviously, this will help us.

[M. Makulbekov] Why did you request help from the Japanese?

[Anuar Alimzhanov] For many reasons. Primarily because all possibilities must be included in the calculations. We have long-standing creative ties and personal acquaintances with Japanese writers—Hirosi Noma, Yukio Kurikhara, Nobuyuki Nakamoto, Yasuki Fukushima and many others. Among them are active participants in the ecological forums concerning Lakes Baykal, Sevan and Biwa conducted regularly under the aegis of the International Baykal Movement. These writers' prestige helped us get in contact with Japanese scientists. Also, Japan is considered a progressive country with regard to the protection of nature, ecological education and its contribution to science. Finally, they have the best equipment. Valentin Rasputin and I were convinced of this at a forum on Biwa Lake. The boat we were on had fantastic equipment. As the boat moved along the captain commented upon the data that appeared and disappeared on a computer screen; data on water temperature at various depths, on currents, salinity, biological and chemical pollution and the condition of the bottom. In my opinion the lake water was very clean, but the Japanese have different standards.

(Note: "Biwa, the largest lake in Japan, is on the island of Honshu. Its surface area is 716 square kilometers and its maximum depth is 86 meters." ("Encyclopedic Dictionary of Geography")

Incidentally, this lake once suffered a great deal from the wastes of civilization. It was saved by housewives.

[M. Makulbekov] ?!

[Anuar Alimzhanov] Yes. Numerous enterprises owned by the largest companies in Japan are located around the lake. Initially the owners were not concerned about the ecological purity of production operations. The local inhabitants and tourists were not much different from ours. However, as time went on the fish started to disappear and people started getting ill; the lake was dying. Then the women took action. Holding hands, they formed a human chain around the lake, making it known that they would protect it and in the process save their families and lives. Housewives refused to use detergents. Synthetic detergent are the number one enemy of water. They switched to soap. They saw to it that not a drop of fat or food waste was dumped into the lake. The struggle to save Lake Biwa heated up, with scientists, writers and the public becoming involved. Pressure was put upon enterprise managers. Industrial wastes stopped poisoning the lake. It turned out to be capable of cleaning itself.

Americans used the same method to save Lake Michigan. I was in Chicago in 1976. The lake's waters were very dirty. Two years ago the inhabitants of Hammond (which is also on Lake Michigan) proudly announced the rebirth of the lake. A "Green" front disseminated propaganda among the population, while companies allocated equipment and resources. The inhabitants of the state started to monitor the rivers flowing into the lake.

[M. Makulbekov] Anuar Turlybekovitch, you obviously have a goal in mind when you give these examples.

[Anuar Alimzhanov] Of course. Without ecological education of adults and children and without the population having elementary knowledge about these matters nobody and nothing can save Lake Balkhash. Governmental decrees and scientific research cannot save the lake. Each of the almost 3 million citizens of Kazakhstan who use waters from Lake Balkhash and the rivers pouring into it should have a sense of self-preservation. I am not afraid of being banal and repeating the truth: Water is life.

Today sovkhoz and kolkhoz fields come right up to the banks of the Ili River. Herbicides, pesticides, mineral and organic fertilizers enter the river and flow into the lake. Vehicles are washed in the river. Sheep are bathed right next to the Ili. All this enters the lake in an endless flow. As is known from school geography texts the lake has no outlet. The lake cannot clean itself; the giant of the steppe does not have the strength for that. The situation is made a hundred times more serious by the city of Balkhash, a center for nonferrous metallurgy in the republic, being located on the north shore. In spite of an indignant public, industrial wastes from the mining and metallurgical combine continue to pollute the long-suffering lake.

Also, the lake level is declining. This is due to the Kapchagay GES [hydroelectric power station] and reservoir. Thanks to nature, this year the lake level increased somewhat, but the water was no cleaner! The pike-perch [*Lusioperca sandraCuv.*] are suffering from disease. The sick fish are caught, processed into mixed feed and fed to livestock. So, the filth comes to our table.

Many people have no idea of how important the waters of Lake Balkhash are to Kazakhstan. This is an invaluable gift of nature! Dozens of rivers that started in the Dzhungarskiy and Zailiyskiy Altay flow into the lake. This is the purest drinking water; it must be cherished as the apple of one's eye.

[M. Makulbekov] Well, good. Let us assume that economic managers and the public understand this. What about the government and parliament of the republic? How can they be cause for encouragement?

[Anuar Alimzhanov] I think that the republic's leaders are as concerned as we are about the fate of Balkhash. But permit me to ask, to what program can they allocate resources to save the lake if not a single scientific institution in Kazakhstan has data on its pollution,

salinity and on the composition of river waters pouring into it? As I have already mentioned, it is only now, with the help of foreign scientists, that we can hope to obtain the first information.

There is one thing that the government and parliament could do to immediately help—halt the construction of the Southern Kazakhstan GRES on the lake's west shore; on a peninsula, one could say. At the last session of the Kazakh SSR Supreme Soviet I put this question to the chairman of the committee in charge of environmental protection: Will the construction of the power plant continue? He answered negatively, saying that the project had been frozen. In fact, it turns out that the GRES [state regional electric power station] project is going full speed ahead. If this senselessness does not cease, then catastrophe is inevitable. I am confident that reason will triumph.

Also, I have to admit that we were not entirely truthful with our Japanese friends who, at the first request, came to help us as friends. We did not show them the GRES. We were afraid that they would be disillusioned and consider the study of the lake to be a waste of effort. Why attempt to save it if it is being deliberately and clearly doomed to death?

[M. Makulbekov] So, can one summarize our discussion by saying that it is necessary to consolidate all forces—science, the authorities and public awareness of those living around Balkhash?

[Anuar Alimzhanov] I will add one more—the mass media.

We must begin with science. It is necessary to open up a Limnology Institute in Kazakhstan (I repeat, we have many lakes) and to train specialists. Scientists from Japan are assisting the Baykal Institute. I can assure you that they will provide equipment free of charge. Also, it is necessary to coordinate the actions of the republic supreme soviet, the State Committee for the Protection of Nature and of ministries and departments. We need scientific assistance from other countries. On our part, and I mean the Kazakh Committee for the Protection of the World, writers in the republic and the Baykal Movement, hope to soon give the government scientific data on the extent of the lake's misfortunes and recommendations to prevent an ecological catastrophe in and around Lake Balkhash. It remains to be added that the struggle for water quality, for saving dying lakes and rivers should not be turned into a campaign, into a one month push. Diligent work by scientists and ecological education in school and industry should be come a norm of life.

Yablokov, Others Score Marchuk Stand on Leningrad Barrier Project

90WN0247A Moscow *IZVESTIYA* in Russian 8 Aug 90 Morning Edition p 3

[Article by A. Yablokov, deputy chairman, USSR Supreme Soviet Committee on Ecological Problems and

the Optimum Utilization of Natural Resources, corresponding member, USSR Academy of Sciences, and others: "Do Scientists Need a President?: Why G.I. Marchuk, President of the USSR Academy of Sciences, Opposes the Conclusions Drawn by the Group of Scientific Experts Regarding the Leningrad Barrier"]

[Text] We are forced to appeal to public opinion in connection with the unworthy and dangerous "apparatchik dances" which have evolved around the problem of the Leningrad Barrier. A success of reason and intelligence evoking optimism—that was how the discussion by the USSR Academy of Sciences Presidium received the conclusions drawn by the Commission on the Leningrad Barrier, a commission which the Presidium itself had set up. Virtually all the USSR people's delegates from Leningrad took part in this discussion.

The decree passed by the Academy of Sciences Presidium unambiguously stated the following: "The work conducted by this commission is approved," "When determining the further fate of the structures which have already been built, we support the commission's opinion regarding the accelerated development, on a competitive basis, of alternative variants for improving the ecological situation in the Neva Inlet." The commission proposes to examine and consider the following variants in particular:

"a) Elimination of the barrier and implementation of local protection of the city of Leningrad from floods;

"b) Redesigning the protective and purification structures with a substantial increase in the barrier's 'transparency,' transferring the discharges from the purification structures and facilities to optimally selected places for this purpose and improving the technology of all the systems for purifying and disinfecting the wastewater, including the local systems of purification at enterprises."

The "apparatchik dances" began immediately after the presidium session. Academician G. Marchuk, president of the USSR Academy of Sciences, deemed it possible to personally introduce his own amendments into the text of the decree, which had been adopted in a collegial manner on 12 July 1990. Moreover, these were so substantive that they evoked an avalanche of protests from the participants at the session.

Within a week, however, the president actually went behind the back of the presidium and personally appealed in the name of the Academy of Sciences to the USSR Council of Ministers with a request to set up still another commission of experts, this time an international one, thereby, in fact, casting doubts upon the competence and objectivity of Soviet scientists and the commission members of the USSR Academy of Sciences Presidium.

It should be noted that this commission, which was created upon the decision of a general assembly of the

USSR Academy of Sciences, has been the most authoritative of all the numerous commissions which have studied the Leningrad Barrier. It includes 43 highly skilled specialists, including five academicians, and eight corresponding members of the USSR Academy of Sciences, two members of the Academy of Medical Sciences, 19 doctors of sciences, and 8 candidates of sciences—ecologists, hydrobiologists, hydrologists, geographers, geneticists, hygienists, medical specialists, oceanologists, persons specializing in hydromechanics, hydraulics, and others. They represented the entire complex of problems connected with the Leningrad Barrier.

And, what was most important, upon the demands of Leningrad public opinion, this group of experts was, for the first time, truly independent of the system of sponsors and proteges, from the departments which designed and set up the plan, from the builders, who, naturally, have a vested interest in continuing their operations.

Evidently the independent stance taken by the commission members was so distasteful to those departments taking part in the construction of the barrier that they undertook a mass attack with demands that persons unsuitable to them be withdrawn from the commission, including academicians and corresponding members of the USSR Academy of Sciences. Lengidroproyekt—the principal designer of the barrier—demanded, for example, that almost one-third of the commission's members be dropped from it.

The commission worked in an atmosphere of high scientific principles. Any viewpoints were thoroughly listened to and discussed without any pressure whatsoever. Decisions were taken as a result of very careful analysis and discussions. It was precisely for this reason that the final conclusions were reached virtually unanimously. Of the 43 commission members, only one did not agree to sign the conclusion. In all groups of experts it is considered that such a result attests to the unanimous opinion of a commission, rather than the concept that it did not reach a unified conclusion, as the president of the USSR Academy of Sciences is attempting to show.

And so the commission came to the well-founded conclusion that the main reason for the sharply worsened ecological situation in the Leningrad region is the presence of the barrier, and that the plan itself was not well-founded, either economically or ecologically. Of course, such a conclusion could not suit the builders and designers.

In his letter to N. Ryzhkov, the president of the Council of Ministers, Academician G. Marchuk, the president of the USSR Academy of Sciences, states that the commission supposedly did not reach a unified conclusion concerning the role to be played by the barrier in ecological changes. On this basis also he requests that yet another international group of experts be called upon, and he proposes to invite the following to participate in it: the International Association of Hydraulic Research and the Delft Hydraulic Research Center.

Moreover, the letter mentioned not a word about the decree already adopted by the USSR Academy of Sciences Presidium, nor about the composition of the commission. An international commission is, of course, useful in certain cases, where a country does not have appropriate specialists or when it is difficult to find experts who are independent of monopolies. But in this case none of this was true: there were enough specialists, and their independence from departments or monopolists was ensured. Just what kind of "independent" commission is the president of the Academy of Sciences proposing to us? The International Association of Hydraulic Research includes among its leading officials none other than Candidate of Sciences B. Kartelev—director of the VNIIG [All-Union Scientific Research Institute for Hydraulic Engineering imeni Vedeneyev] and one of the developers of the barrier plan. The hydraulic model executed by this institute was subjected to harsh criticism in the conclusion of the commission, whose body included Academician L. Sedov, the leading authority and founder of the method of hydraulic modeling.

With lightning speed, already on 28 June, the USSR Council of Ministers had already entrusted the GKNT [State Committee for Science and Technology] with the task of preparing, with the participation of the USSR Academy of Sciences, the USSR Goskompriroda [State Committee for Environmental Protection], USSR Gosplan, the RSFSR Council of Ministers, and other interested organizations, specific measures for implementing the proposals contained in the letter from Academician G. Marchuk. The State Committee for Science and Technology is examining and considering this issue in the spirit of the "good old days" of stagnation: here it supports the proposal by G. Marchuk regarding the feasibility of conducting in 1990 an additional comprehensive study by experts of the plan for the Leningrad Barrier. Moreover, the GKNT proposes that this expert study be conducted "using the funds for the incomplete operations and for the composite estimated expanses for building the complex to protect Leningrad from floods," that is, for the estimated funds allocated for building the barrier.

And so everything is clear: the "independent," expert study will be conducted under the direction of the designers and using their money. The result of the "game" is predetermined: the administrative-command "team" will start and will "win." And not somewhere in the stagnant years of 1979-1980, but in our own times, in the sixth year of perestroika.

The stance (or, more precisely, the departure from a principled stance) taken by the president of the USSR Academy of Sciences on this issue is clearly in conflict with elementary logic. It truly is because, of course, it was specifically the academy leadership which appointed its own commission of experts, having assembled the flower of our science which it had at its disposal. By not trusting this commission's conclusions, Guriy Ivanovich

Marchuk is proclaiming his distrust in this leadership and, therefore, primarily, in himself.

But there will be no contradiction of any kind if we assume that the governing factor here is not logic, not scientific proofs, but in the predetermined "stance" of the president himself: what does not suit him specifically here is the fact that the commission unambiguously declared itself to be against the barrier. Between two poles of a magnet, he himself experiences greater attraction specifically toward the administrative-command "pole." Guriy Ivanovich frequently refers to the fact that the Academy, as he says, executes the tasks assigned to it by the government, although it should be objective and impartial. But during the present-day period the president himself should sometimes take his own stance and not always "salute," or try to predict the desires of the "higher-ups." With all our respect for the government, it is bothersome as to why the president of the Academy of Sciences did not directly address the Leningrad Soviet. Was it not because he well knew the negative attitude of its chairman and the other new "city fathers" toward the barrier, this "child of the Romanov-type stagnation period?" Was it not because he assumed that he would find a more complaisant or obliging attitude in the USSR Council of Ministers (and, indeed, that is the way it has turned out on the whole). Of course, during the present-day period the Leningrad Soviet, nevertheless, cannot be bypassed in such a truly All-Union, but vitally Leningrad, issue. And one can quite precisely forecast what the wishes of the Soviet authority of this city on the Neva will be when the question of the barrier's fate comes up for discussion at its autumn session. And that is why the advocates of the "great construction project" are in such a hurry to go over the head of the Leningrad Soviet.

For some reason, when it is a matter of our science's staff members blocking the path to spending money on anti-ecological plans, their actions in recent years have more and more objectively "played into the hands" of precisely the defenders of such plans, as if they were not confident that both sides were given a balanced hearing. That's the way it was in the case of the Volga-Chogray Canal, and that's the way it was with the Leningrad Barrier. The times are changing unrecognizably. But the actions of the president of the USSR Academy of Sciences have remained all-too recognizably unchanged. They are in very fine harmony with the unwritten imperative of the administrative-command system and serve departmental, i.e., bureaucratic interests rather than scientific truth.

Director Explains Tasks of New Moldavian State Environmental Department

90WN0248A Kishinev MOLODEZH MOLDAVII
in Russian 2 Aug 90 p 2

[Interview with Moldavian State University Professor I. I. Dedyu, doctor of sciences and general director of the State Department of the Environment and Natural

Resources under the SSRM (Soviet Socialist Republic of Moldavia) Supreme Soviet, by Yu. Semenova; date, place, and time not specified]

[Text] "In my opinion, your newspaper is one of the most reactionary publications"—the newly confirmed general director of the State Department of the Environment and Natural Resources just created under the SSRM Supreme Soviet began our dialog with that statement.

But, despite his quite negative opinion of MOLODEZH MOLDAVII, Doctor of Sciences and Moldavian State University Professor I. I. Dedyu willingly agreed to the interview. After taking up his new post, he abandoned political activity and favors consolidating all forces to protect the environment, regardless of their ideological views.

[Semenova] Ion Ilyich, I congratulate you on such a high appointment. My question is: as was decided at the SSRM Supreme Soviet session, the State Department you head is not subordinate to the Council of Ministers.

[Dedyu] Yes. For now it is the only republic department which is subordinate to the parliament and its general director is subordinate only to the Moldavian Supreme Soviet session. A long and exhausting struggle preceded the appearance of this independent organ: according to M. Druk's conception, the department was to be part of the government. But I argued that in that case, from the legal standpoint we would have no power to monitor departments.

Imagine the situation: the construction of some ecologically harmful production facility has been planned. Basing the need for a new plant on economic considerations, the prime minister could give me directive instructions and simply pressure me and I would have to consent to this construction. If, I repeat, we were subordinate to the Council of Ministers. But by operating under the Supreme Soviet, we would be insured against such things. I must give credit to M. Druk; he evaluated the situation correctly and at the session he abandoned his conception and voted to subordinate the State Department to the parliament.

[Semenova] Will the State Committee for the Protection of Nature and all the water inspection offices be included in the State Department or will the functions continue to be fragmented?

[Dedyu] No. We are concentrating all natural resources—water, land, and forests—in the same hands. We alone will manage their use. A scientific, legal, and economic expert appraisal panel will be formed for each government order. We will decide, for example, whether or not to allocate land for construction. In any case, our decision will be final.

[Semenova] It is obviously too early to speak of any global program of nature and environmental conservation, but obviously the main areas of work have already been defined.

[Dedyu] They have been. The first is fundamental perestroika of the structure, legal rights, and obligations of nature conservation organs. An inventory of all natural resources will be made at all levels—beginning with the kolkhoz and the rural soviet and ending with the republic. An evaluation of environmental quality will be made. Draft laws on nature conservation, nature use, taxation, and the like will be developed and presented at the fall session of the Supreme Soviet.

The second thing is organization of ecological monitoring, that is, a comprehensive system to monitor and evaluate predicted changes in the natural environment in order to use it most rationally.

The third thing is ecological education and indoctrination of the population. The entire population, beginning with the peasant and ending with the manager of any rank should have the proper ecological sophistication; and this should provide the basis to hold any nature user accountable.

Finally, the fourth thing is establishment and development of both intra-Union and international ties.

That is as far as tactics go. But the main strategic direction of the State Department's work will be developing the scientific, legal, and organizational foundations of measures to protect the environment, that is, to introduce no-waste and low-waste technologies into agriculture, industry, and daily life. Unfortunately, the entire world, the United States, and France, and the FRG, and Japan, and other countries included, are making a fatal mistake today: they are spending intellectual efforts and material resources for purification structures rather than for no-waste technologies, and from the standpoint of preventive measures that is altogether unpromising. We are trying not to repeat the mistake.

[Semenova] Everything that you have told about is a matter of the future. They are problems which will not be resolved in one day. But the ecological situation today frightens people. They want to eat clean food products and enjoy clean water now without waiting for the introduction of no-waste technologies. And they have a right to expect that since a special department has been created, the situation will change for the better in the shortest possible time. They are tired of talk, don't you know. So they would like to hear of the first steps on the most ordinary everyday level.

[Dedyu] First of all, through the mass media the department will pass on reliable information on the condition of the environment. People should know what kind of air they are breathing, what they are eating, and what they are drinking.

We will utterly and completely support any movement to protect the environment, including through rallies, strikes, and picket lines. We are trying to do it in such a way that people trust us. And first of all we will "pressure" the Ministry of Trade and try to see that the food products on sale are ecologically clean, regardless of what point of the globe they come from. And, of course, we are going to monitor agriculture and industrial enterprises very closely.

[Semenova] Who will work in the Department?

[Dedyu] Only professionals. I don't need demagogic propagandists or dilettante supporters of the "Greens". Only first-rate professionals and experienced specialists. It is too serious a department to allow just any impractical schemers or adventurists in it.

We will also train cadres. I am not abandoning my scientific activities; I will continue to be in charge of the inter-VUZ [higher education institution] ecology department; that, by the way, was my second condition when I stood for general director. Everyone will study essential ecology, beginning with medical workers and ending, let us say, with musicians. It is our daily bread if we want to survive.

[Semenova] At the session which ratified the new department and you as its general director, a law was passed which stipulates that a leader of your rank cannot be a member of any political organization. I believe it is common knowledge that you are a member of the CPSU. How will your new appointment tally with your party principles?

[Dedyu] I have been carrying a party card for 40 years. And now, when a law forbids me to be in the ranks of the CPSU, I certainly do not intend to climb up to the roof of the university and publicly burn it.

I will follow the natural path—I will surrender my party card for the term of this leadership position.

I am not a child and I do not change my principles. I was against the decision of the 2nd Congress of the National Front, which voted that a National Front member could not be a member of another political organization. As a communist, I was formally expelled from the National Front, even though I was one of the founders of this movement. It is not the party which is to blame for the fact that such a situation has taken shape, but its elite. And therefore I did not abandon membership in the CPSU at that time.

Now it is a different matter. An executive does not have the right to "carry" the interests of one party or another, I agree with that. So I will temporarily give up my party card.

As for the other workers in the department, for goodness' sake let them be involved in politics. In their spare time. Let them defend the interests of their parties. After work.

And I beg to emphasize especially that our task is not to defend the ideas of the National Front, the Intermovement, or Gagauz-khalky. Our task is to preserve the genofund of the republic. The genofund of the republic, not the genofund of the Moldavians, the Gagauz, the Jews, or the Russians separately. Let us end on that note.

[Semenova] Thank you for the interview. Good-bye.

Findings of White Sea Ecological Disaster Commission Reported

*90WN0248B Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 10 Aug 90
Second Edition p 6*

[Article by Professor A. Alimov, doctor of biological sciences and chairman of the interdepartmental commission, and Professor V. Khlebovich, doctor of biological sciences and member of the commission: "Just What Happened on the White Sea?"]

[Text] In early May a large number of dead or dying starfish, crabs, and various other marine dwellers were found cast by a storm onto the Letny Coast in the Dvinskaya Bay of the White Sea. From 10 through 31 May three such incidents were seen. In all during this time about 6 million dead starfish, 7,500 crabs, and approximately 9,000 mussels were counted on the coastal strip 60 kilometers long.

We Report the Details

We must say that storms frequently cast up dead animals, and at times in large numbers. But the uniqueness of what happened this year was the unprecedentedly large scale.

The first discoveries and preliminary results of analyses did not permit an answer to the question of the causes of the animals' deaths. As per the instructions of the USSR Council of Ministers and the USSR Academy of Sciences, an interdepartmental commission was organized. Scientists of the USSR Academy of Sciences, the USSR Ministry of Health, the USSR Ministry of Defense, the USSR State Committee for Hydrometeorology and Environmental Control, the Navy, the USSR Council of Ministers, the USSR Ministry of Maritime Fleet Northern Steamship company, and the Arkhangelsk Oblispolkom as well as experts from a number of scientific institutes were members of this commission.

All the hypotheses proposed were carefully analyzed. Hypotheses about defreshening of the water and the impact of waste water from Arkhangelsk and Severodvinsk were not confirmed (in that case the main impact should have been directed at the Zimniy Coast of the bay); virus and algal hypotheses, the impact of radioactive contamination (the radiation background of the region is within the norm), the impact of heavy metal salts, acoustic influences, and others were rejected. Let us dwell specially on examining only those hypotheses which were most actively promoted in the mass information media.

In fact, on 7 December 1989 several tons of missile fuel oxidizer (nitric acid) were discharged into the sea as a result of an accident on a submarine 105 kilometers from shore. Let us note that the depth at the site of the accident was over 100 meters. Taking that into account and the distance to the Letny Coast, as well as the almost half year that had passed, it is impossible to tie the animals' deaths to the results of the accident. Nor could the falling of a missile with residual fuel into the bay at a depth of 200 meters in April 1990 be the cause, nor could the fall of a second missile which happened almost a month after the first sign of the death of marine animals.

A great deal of attention was devoted to examining the hypothesis of the possibility that the animals were poisoned by combat toxic agents. The appearance of this hypothesis was a result of the fact that it was precisely during the time of the mass death of the animals that the Arkhangelsk Fish Combine held civil defense training and decided to inspect the fish caught near the Letny Coast for possible mustard gas content. Surprisingly, almost all the fish and starfish had a positive reaction to sulfurous mustard gas. Unfortunately, this version reached the newspapers right off without additional verification. A second test for the content of these compounds in fish showed a negative reaction.

After careful analysis of the data obtained, the commission came to the conclusion that the death of the marine animals occurred because of the short-term but powerful impact of toxic substances containing sulfurous or sulfurorganic compounds. They could be petroleum products with a large amount of sulfur, for example. They could have fallen into the sea as a result of flushing out tanks or other reservoirs installed in ships, for example. However, inasmuch as it was impossible to ascertain either the substance itself or its source, what was said should be taken as the most plausible hypothesis.

In late June biocenosis data in the area of the animals' deaths were already normal. It would be appropriate to evaluate the scope of what happened. According to rough estimates, there are about 400 million to 4 billion starfish within the boundaries of the Letny Coast section where the death of the animals was observed. The number of starfish cast onto shore was no more than 1 percent of the total number.

The commission was unable to ascertain the nature or source of the toxic substances whose action resulted in the death of the animals—a fairly long time had passed since the event had occurred. Because of that, monitoring, above all in the Letny Coast zone, becomes especially important.

The situation which is developing in the White Sea cannot be considered at all satisfactory. Many of its sections are under strong pressure from economic activity. This is especially true of the Dvinskaya Bay, which receives untreated or poorly treated waste water from the enterprises of Arkhangelsk and Severodvinsk. It should be taken into

account that the White Sea is a very unique body of water with a distinctive layering of its waters, which hardly mix at all with one another—heavy, cold, arctic Barents Sea waters with high salt content and more freshened White Sea water proper. The sea is characterized by a relatively small water volume and circulating currents in its bays. All this helps it become a unique kind of sedimentation pond for pollutants entering it.

The results of the commission's work clearly showed the pressing need to create a special subdivision in the country to efficiently recruit the appropriate scientific forces to react rapidly to ecological disasters. It should be equipped with the most modern analytical, measuring, and other instruments and equipment and be mobile. It can be formed, for example, under the USSR State Committee for Nature Conservation, where all the information related to nature conservation in particular regions should be accumulated.

The efficient and high-quality work of the Arkhangelsk Oblast Nature Conservation Committee must be mentioned. The military did not put any obstacles in the way of seeking the causes of what happened; on the contrary, they helped energetically in the work.

But can such a phenomenon happen again? Unfortunately, we cannot give a negative answer to that question. The ecological situation in the White Sea, especially in the vicinity of industrial cities, is very strained, and monitoring the activities of various organizations, enterprises, ships, and the like is difficult, especially when the monitoring organs are still in the formative stage. So any kind of surprise is possible. But they can be reduced to a minimum, if each resident of the White Sea region considers it his own home and treats the beneficent sea like his own home, and with great respect.

Russian Culture Association Holds Founding Congress

Bondarev Elected Head, Addresses Meeting

90UN23824 Moscow LITERATURNAYA ROSSIYA in Russian No 25, 22 Jun 90 p 5

[Speech by Yuriy Bondarev, head, at the Founding Congress of Yedineniye: "The Fate of Russia"; first two paragraphs are LITERATURNAYA ROSSIYA introduction]

[Text] On 14 and 15 June the founding congress of the All-Russian Culture Association "Yedineniye" took place in Moscow. The following spoke at the congress: Yu. Bondarev, Yu. Prokushhev, N. Damdinov, S. Zolotsev, A. Kuzmin, A. Prokhanov, E. Safonov, Ye. Sigarev, archpriest N. Arkhangelskiy, Mufti Talgat Tadzhuddin, and others. Yu. Bondarev was elected president, Yu. Prokushhev—vice-president, of Yedineniye.

We are publishing the speech of Yu. Bondarev at the congress.

Perhaps the time is coming when modern philosophy, sociology, and ethics will finally be saturated with the pain of the century to the point of rage. The universal dreamers, the furious visionaries, the Christian consolers, and the cruel and kind madmen, by the will of universal regularities, the power of gold, and, of course, the immortal passions of people, did not become the triumphant architects of an earthly paradise, the utopian state of the sun. They (however brilliant they were) were the masters, for the most part, of period changes in the human theater, where, as before, the familiar characters were waiting in the wings to come out on the stage: Injustice, cruelty, cowardly anger, laziness, lie and unconcern of the man in the street doomed to a vegetative life, who wants to survive among the burial grounds of truths vulgarized and buried by them.

The main thing: Just as soon as the guillotine started to work—incidentally, invented by a Paris physician—only the ruthless sound of the knife chopping off heads remained of the concepts of "freedom", "equality", and "fraternity". As soon as the Solovetskiy Monastery ceased to be a monastery and was transformed into a place of violence, the concept of the "building of socialism" swayed and moved away into a marshy fog.

At the crossroads of history, literature, however, blew a draught, which aroused a momentary stir, a certain panic in musty corners, but did not win a complete victory, did not occupy the throne of the Almighty. For it is Politics, Money, Greed, Nationalism, and the enemies of culture classified as secret which sit on the throne of power from time immemorial to the present.

In the history of all civilizations, the artists were the first to become proficient in the emancipation of people, and the new arrived. The different consolidated itself, the different quickly depreciated, grew old, and died out, as

everything fashionable grows old and dies in use. Time rules over mankind and reigns over everything.

In the mid 1970's in Europe, including in our country, about which, it goes without saying, the press was silent, the alienation of people and the general feeling of isolation became especially aggravated (the forgotten "I" in the meek crowd, the increased indifference in the hermetic society), there began, as it were, a movement of a glacier—the cooling of human relations, the loss of ecological balance, the crisis of the closeness of everything living on the earth, the painful discrepancy between desire and reality, between the desired and the prohibited, between word and deed—and simultaneously with this, the natural right of joy and love was lost. Something had happened to us.

At that time there appeared in the literature of Russia an incinerated hero, living in the almost incorrigible world of the present; any day rose before him in his consciousness like the unknown, frightening world of the future. Russian art attained its peak, its crest, during these years, for the postwar hero was discovered, the representative of generations deceived in, and dissatisfied with something—courageous and weak, wistful and restless, charming and tired, miserable and happy, a Don Quixote and a Shakespearean grave-digger. The literary and intellectual culture of this time frequently turned to the memory—more precisely—to the conscience of the generations that have departed. That art was created in overcoming the swampy territories of court criticism, in the never-ending resistance to the cruel environment of the all-seeing eyes of censorship. And, speaking sincerely, these not at all simply conquered summits of "military," "village," and "city" prose of the 1970's and 1980's were not reached by a single one of the boldest Alpinists of perestroika, who have in their possession reliable modern alpenstocks in the form of triumphant epithets of friendly criticism. There is nothing surprising in this paradox because in art and culture there is only struggle and antagonism—these are both a heavy cross and wreaths of thorns, an obsessed movement toward the goal, which only seems to be a diamond reward, but in actual fact is granite, always covered, and then also with blood.

The so-called socialist realism was a poorly-sewn suit, concealing the nakedness of stunted talent. The talent of a serious artist was never confined in any method. Confirmed by the state seal, the law in art is the tyranny of talent, and culture has always risen in revolt against this tyranny. Legalized, as a statute, an artistic method is always immoral, devoid of feeling, and for this reason cannot be absolutely correct. A single and unshakeable pattern is counter-indicative to any culture, even if it is the masterpiece of masterpieces. You see, culture most likely is the subjective pattern of the objective world. No, it is erroneous and dangerous to think that, entering the land of a foreign and unfamiliar aesthetics, we are entering hostile territory. There is a single world culture, similar to a gigantic chain of pearls with various shades of pearls.

In the last few years I have been afraid that our multi-national culture of Russia is becoming, as it were, an ossified list of ethnographic property, amateur museums, museum workers, souvenir sights, samovars, spice-cakes and pretzels, losing the main thing, the genuinely popular and moral manifestation—its dignity, the pride of sources, love for the age-old and bookish [knizhnny] word, sanctified by the great speech of the great writers, respect for the wisdom of experience and enlightenment, so necessary now, like freedom, respect for education, which has fallen to the state of degradation; finally, healthy and reasonable relations between parents and children, teacher and students, you see, the older and younger generations at times speak in different languages, not understanding one another, like foreigners, and because of the lack of understanding the moral supports of the future collapse. The child, in growing up, does not become the son or daughter of the parents, but a son and daughter of the time. And it, our de-Christianized world, is able to corrupt the soul, to steal love, the good, and responsiveness, and to bestow cruelty. Language, Art, History, Education—the essential pillars of culture—for decades have been undercut by the forces of evil deformity, betrayal and stupidity, and one fine day for some and a tragic day for others, these columns may come tumbling down, burying under the debris the very great culture of Russia, as this was the case with powerful civilizations known to us, with Egypt, with unforgettable Ancient Greece. "Wise was Sophocles, still wiser Euripides, but the wisest of all was Socrates." Who personifies and preserves our Russian wisdom? And is it possible in times full of world stagnation, of the shameful semi-famine of Russia and the downfall of eternal values to find solid moral reference points?

Freedom, glasnost, democracy are an indisputable blessing in human society, but only when the members of society have grown up or are growing up with consciousness to this blessing. The guarantee of glasnost consists in the fact that the freedom of speech of one must be reasonably limited by the freedom of speech of the other. And precisely—by equality, for there is no higher and lower freedom. There is equality which encompasses all—freedom without privileges. Otherwise ultrapolitical forces under the banners of democracy paralyze democracy and under the banners of glasnost turn glasnost into impunity, into persecution of dissidents.

In our time, when a large part of the press has been usurped by the influence of high patronage, actions have more than once been undertaken to run with the bulldozer of Russophobia over the graves of the prophets of genius, the apostles of philosophical thought, over the giants of our planetary literature (Pushkin, Gorki, Mayakovskiy, Yesenin, Sholokhov), scoffing under the tin rattle of numerous drums at Russian culture, every now and then with the same prodigious rattle elevating to the pedestal the invented authorities. However, it is well known: If hatred is unabating restrained anger, then stupidity is its liberator. Apart from that, the present-day

noises, to express ourselves in the language of the ecologists, are an integral part of our existence. They burst into our conscience every day, deafening, similar to a loud political show, accompanying the election of Reagan as president. This was the victory of a man of movie standard, and this was the victory, the triumph of mass culture, which, unfortunately, exerted an influence on all of us. In politics, everything has significance and a purpose: Borrowings, aspersions, rumors, the backs of people, which they use like the steps of a staircase leading upstairs to power, nationalism with its tested levers of "divide and rule", the element of the crowd, which they pass off as the will of the people, and art, which they want to reshape into a subservient ideology.

And how many advocates of spiritual chaos have not talked to the average citizen about the fact that "we need to be patient", that we have "not yet learned," no matter how much we have repeated this, that our salvation lies in the slogan of "more democracy and socialism," this is not the point.

Because of the long-term haplessness of Russia, a bright guiding star has not yet risen in our cloudy sky. The dawn has not yet begun, but during the past few years we have more than once heard on our sold and betrayed land the third, already prophetic cry of the Biblical rooster. We have become the hostages of chronic misfortune. In Russia there is the highest infant mortality. And the most serious ecological situation.

In our fatherland the villages have become deserted, the ancient cities are falling into decay and are being destroyed, which in former times were rich and famous for their 1000-year old culture. And it was not yesterday that the principal centers of national pride—the Tretyakov Gallery, the State Historical Museum—were closed. Russia, with a population of 150 million, does not have an academy, no television, paper has been taken away, book publishing is falling, we do not have elaborations of solid school programs, or textbooks tested by practice. The Russian people does not have its own intelligentsia in sufficient measure.

And especially now we are convinced that the means of meaningless optimism, which for some time has been put into circulation by different politicians with respect to Russia, are only methods of false consolation. It gives rise at first to hope, then to sluggishness, inertia, and lack of will, and in the end—despair of those led into a blind alley. Today this reassuring method of sly and insidious promise ("all will come right in the end and will be ground again") should be overturned by the opposite method—superenergy, struggle, and opposition.

So that we have—a left-wing government and a right-wing people, or a left-wing people and a right-wing government?

No, it is not a deceptive optimism that will save Russia, but good sense, the complete realization of the dramatic nature of the situation, and the strong national institutions which express the spiritual integrity and beauty of

the peoples. A merry and tourist style of life is not our way and our nature, which is now being created by vulgar and, of course, borrowed television advertising. We have borne and are bearing too many sacrifices.

In the distressing days when faith has been destroyed and ideals have been thrown into a pit, when the politically and spiritually tired country, disillusioned from clumsy experiments, is not prepared for new shocks (market, competition, and unemployment), only the creation of a viable moral doctrine is the sole path to economic salvation, if we, united, will find this last path of common destiny.

Will our poor and talented peoples pass through their starry moments? Everything depends on us, on the material and spiritual culture which we will preserve, restore, demand and bring to the all-Russian brotherhood for the sake of a great moral idea.

In this sense, Russia for the time being is no man's land. Russia must be ours, strong and enlightened, proud and charitable.

Further Congress Speeches

*90UN2382B Moscow LITERATURNAYA ROSSIYA
in Russian No 27, 6 Jul 90 pp 8-10*

[Speeches by participants of the founding congress of the Russian Culture Association: "With Faith in Spiritual Unity"]

[Text] On 14 and 15 June, the founding congress of the All-Russian Cultural Association "Yedineniye" was held, which brought together representatives of all the peoples of Russia. In No 25 of the weekly the speech of Yu. V. Bondarev was published, who was elected president of Yedineniye. Today we invite the readers' attention to fragments of the speeches of other participants of the congress.

Yu. L. Prokushev, Vice President of Yedineniye

It has always been the case in the history of our Homeland that the best and brightest spirits of Russia—multinational, long-suffering, and heroic Russia—during crucial epochs and crisis years, the protestations of other politicians notwithstanding that everything will be OK, foresaw and sensed the real possibility of spiritual cataclysms. And not only sensed, but what is the main thing, acted, including by word.

It is time for all to realize especially for those in the top echelons of power, including the president, for all who are officially [gosudarstvenno] responsible for the culture and education of the people, to realize the indisputable truth—no restructuring, no market relations, even the most regulated ones, will bring success if the ominous radiation of non-spirituality and antinational mass culture with such an unbridled state of total permissiveness will continue to affect the spiritual and moral foundations of our Homeland. Our forefathers won victory over

the numerous enemies of Russia not so much through arms as through the inflexible force of the spirit, the unification of peoples, and all its social strata in the name of the great idea of justice and the defense of our native land.

The role of the Word, the delicate, the most stable, and most durable cement of the spirituality of the people, is great in this spiritual unity.

The word can unite peoples, and it can separate and embroil, introduce division and confusion in the souls of people. Unfortunately, tragedies and internecine dissension take place even now. And we should do everything so that in the future there will not be any large or small Karabakhs in our country, so that no blood is shed in peacetime, and so that there are no refugees and destitute people.

Today, as never before, the Word of truth is needed. The word of the soul and the heart, which would reach everybody, and would awaken the feeling of responsibility for our land and for the life of every family and every home.

The congress should with all determination declare that Yedineniye is a public enlightenment, socio-cultural mass organization. This does not mean that we are outside of politics. But today there has been enough meetings and there has been enough meeting democracy. Today it is necessary. This is precisely what dictates the program of the association, its draft "We Are Russians" and its Statute.

The draft program of the association includes nine basic directions of its future activity. They are the following:

"Finding Its Voice." Press, the mass media.

"Faith." Questions of freedom of conscience and religion.

"Family and Home." Upbringing of the new generations.

"Defense of the Fatherland." Yedineniye and the Armed Forces.

"The Future and Hope." Yedineniye and the young people.

"The Call of the Fatherland." Yedineniye and compatriots abroad.

"Charity." Charitable activity.

"The Land and Man on It." Yedineniye and creation.

As is evident, the draft program strives to encompass the most important sides and fundamental aspects of the spiritual life of the Russians, outlining in so doing the concrete immediate and long-term goals and tasks. Today it is especially important not to talk in general about spirituality, but to set forth what can and must realistically be done in the sphere of culture and spiritual

renewal. Of course, there must be its programs of activity "Yedineniye in the Autonomous Republics, Krays, Oblasts, Cities, and Rural Rayons of Russia." Without this movement of creative thought, without the lively work in the provinces, the existence of Yedineniye itself as a mass organization is unthinkable.

The practical realization is possible only with the direct participation of all the Russian figures in literature, culture, science, education, and the Orthodox Church, all state and public institutions and services, and, in the final analysis—the entire people.

Here is a lot of work. Look at the mutilated, distorted face of our earth. Most likely, in the world there is not one country where there are so many destroyed, forgotten, and half-forgotten monuments of culture, both secular and spiritual.

To build nationwide, to resuscitate and improve the present-day and historical face of Russia in the last decade of the present century, to enter into the 21st century as a great spiritual power—such, perhaps, is the most humane and patriotic goal time places before us, Russians.

One can attain this goal only on one indispensable condition: If not only the Church, not only the Society for the Preservation of Monuments, not only the state, but all of us, all together, in every town and village, we will think about this and act, we will work tirelessly and voluntarily, having a concrete plan for the restoration of every historical monument, every cathedral and monastery, every memorial country estate, every old building, and every monument of military glory and labor heroism....

If, as the result of the oblivion of the past and the loss of the feeling of the Fatherland and national pride for the Homeland, our souls, especially the young ones, prove to be morally and spiritually empty, and if, God forbid, the historical memory of the people becomes shallow to the bottom, this will inevitably turn into the most terrible and irreparable misfortune for Russia and for the whole country.

It should be emphasized in particular that the problems mapped out in our program have now a global-universal character. These are the problems of the century. In discussing the lack of spirituality, our mass media in vain put the emphasis only on Russia. In the 20th century, the lack of spirituality is a tragedy of all of mankind, and it was by no means engendered by Russia.

We justifiably criticize a great deal that was tragic and bitter in the 1920's and 1930's: The lawlessness, the repressions, and the cult of the personality. At the same time, we must remember that there was also another aspect of life. At this time, all Russia "began to learn." From the remote places of Russia, yesterday's Red Army soldiers, workers, and peasants came into the student lecture halls. Talented and obsessed people, they mastered knowledge in order, after a few years, to head up

the construction of defense plants and metallurgical combines, to direct scientific institutes and design bureos.... It is from their midst that the Ilyushins, Tupolevs, Korolevs, and many other outstanding organizers of science and production. It was with their direct participation on the eve of and during the Great Patriotic War that the best tanks and airplanes in the world were built in our country. Enormous scientific-technical potential was created, which made it possible for the Russian Yuriy Gagarin to be the first in the world to take a step into space. This, too, is our history, the history of a nationwide struggle for education.

At the present time, the urgent task of the development of education, science and culture again acutely arises before Russia.

I think that Yedineniye should develop and introduce in the legislative organs of the republic, as an alternative, a law on education in Russia, for without education we will perish both spiritually and morally.

The main principle of our Statute is genuine democratism and nationality. If we do not reach the remote places, if we do not create centers of unity, spirituality, and the word in plants, in the army, the VUZ's and every school, we are not worth a farthing. In this case we will turn into one of today's numerous elitist formal and informal associations, which do not have strong spiritual roots in the people.

In preparing the congress, we aspired not to investigate thoroughly the group dissensions, the contradictions and group predilections which, unfortunately, do exist in our creative unions and in other organizations. We and you have more important business than the "left-wingers" and the "right-wingers," the "radicals" and the "antiradicals."

Allow me in conclusion to remind you of the words of the great Pushkin from his letter to Chaadayev: "...I am far from admiring everything I see around me; as a man of letters, I am embittered; as a man of prejudices, I am offended. But I swear to you on my honor that I would not want to change my fatherland for anything in the world, or to have any other history than that of our ancestors, such as God gave it to us."

S. F. Bondarchuk, Film Director

I fully support the program of Yedineniye and will take part in its realization. Today concrete things are necessary. The Obyedineniye Studio has been created in the USSR State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting. Its activity is aimed at the realization of a grandiose project, calculated for many years. This program proposes the creation of documentary and art films on the basis of the material of the history of the Russian state.

I am turning to you with the request to take part in the realization of this project, which will serve the noble cause of the spiritual renewal of Russia.

N. Konstantinovich, Archpriest

As a representative of the Russian Orthodox Church, it gives me great pleasure to speak before me now, to express if only a few thoughts.

The profound changes that are taking place in our country—perestroika, glasnost, new political thinking—have not passed by our Holy Orthodox Russian Church.

In 1988, at the Pomestnyy Sobor [National Council], which was assembled at that time in honor of the glorious jubilee—the 1000th anniversary of the Christening of Russia—a new Statute was adopted and approved confirmed by the Soviet government, which gives great possibilities to the church and the clergy to take the most active part in the public and even political life of the country.

The church reminds all people of the unity of mankind, of the fact that any manifestations of nationalism that are observed in our country will be in contradiction with the divine law and even human morality.

I would like to express deep satisfaction with the activity of the patriotic forces of Russia, in particular of the association, whose congress is now taking place in our country. We especially welcome the circumstance that Yedineniye is not relegating the law of the freedom of conscience, freedom of speech, and freedom of religion to last place.

S. P. Tkachev, USSR People's Artist

We are all in need of unification. And we, the artists, experience the lack of protection, both of ourselves and of our art. The Supreme Soviet is not disposed to us, the questions of culture, once again, as previously, are relegated to second place.

It seems, the bitter experience of the past, when the monuments of history and architecture were destroyed, could teach us a great deal, but even today we see cases of a barbarian attitude to culture. They did not splash out accidentally, they were prepared, as it were, little by little in the course of many years. They were destroyed and broken up not only in the 1920's, but also in the 1970's and 1980's. In the palaces of culture and clubs, the fine works of Grabar and Konchalovskiy, which belong in the best museums of the country, were written off like cut-price inventory, like some kind of table or chair. The uneasiness does not leave me: What will be with the 300 rural picture galleries that were created by local enthusiasts in the remote places of Russia—you know, they were deprived of any status and, in essence, were without rights.

At the same time, with the destruction of the so-called unpromising villages, the traditional popular art also dies out. The attempt to transfer the artistic trades to the city leads to their degeneration. But you see, precisely in national culture lie the centuries-long experience of the people, its soul, and the sources of the coming art.

Today a certain young elite of city ferment, so to speak, is spreading increasingly strongly in art. It must be stated with sadness that the path to great art is, in essence, closed to children who have been graduated from rural rayon schools. And not because they have little talent—they simply do not have such thorough training as the city children, the artistic environment is missing. And there will hardly be new Repins if we leave the remote places on a cultural starvation ration.

Already a long time ago, the moment ripened for the government to develop at long last the basic directions of cultural policy for the long term. And the present congress should unite all of us in order not to permit strife between the peoples of Russia, as well as between the remote places of Russia and Moscow, which must become the true collector of all the spiritual forces of the renewal of Russia.

L. Ye. Smirnova, Librarian

I live and work in the village, and for this reason I shall speak about rural culture. What state it has reached may be illustrated by a few examples. At some time, in the 1920's and 1930's, my father worked as a village librarian. Now in the place of this village library and reading room, there is a library. The collection in previous years was 8,000 books, but now it is 4,000.

The lack of social protection of the rural cultural workers fills one with alarm. The moral and material prestige is low. We are suffering very much from the arbitrariness of the local authorities. Our departments of culture were transformed into bureaucratic apparatuses. These are generals of culture, who have neither power, nor finances, nor even competence.

Perhaps, only a few persons, a small group of enthusiasts, still pull this cart, rural culture, behind them in order not to let it perish once and for all. If things continue in this way, the village, which as it has grown spiritually poor now, will once and for all be bogged down in ignorance and will ruin itself with drink.

The village where I live is very rich with traditions. Moreover, it is very picturesque. Our places are Venetian, and in our villages it is quite possible to create a rural cultural center. If only the cultural figures were found who would help us. You know, the intellectual is, above all, a zealot. This was always a characteristic of the Russian intelligentsia, it always went to the people and brought culture and knowledge.

Now our intelligentsia has split. I believe that our strength lies not in competition, not in contradictions, but in unity. And only then can we renew the culture of Russia.

**A. A. Prokhanov, Editor-in-Chief of the Journal
SOVETSKAYA LITERATURA**

It is obvious to all of us that the chief misfortune of our Russian patriotic movement today consists in the

absence of leaders. We have many outstanding artists, orators, clairvoyants, and prophets. We have very few leaders. We are searching for these leaders passionately and avidly, but we do not find them either in the army, or in the party, or among economists. Now is the kind of moment when all truths have been expressed, all formulas have been pronounced, and all realistic variants have been proclaimed. The time has come to put them into effect. And here we proved to be in a tragic situation. The idea, which has been left in the air, thus will die in the wilderness with a mournful sound.

Already now a sparkling, ruthless pole-axe has been raised over all of Russian literature, whose name is the market. The blow is taking place in at least four directions.

The first—they will stop printing us because we, everyone because of his talent, endowments, and outstanding or modest name during these 5 years did not fall into the field of concentrated, highly-strung propaganda and criticism, which on the basis of its ratings succeeded in rejecting the large majority of our writers and in forming an elitist, commercially secured group, which will be published in editions going into the millions.

The second—the madness, Draconian taxes. Imagine the artist, the writer, who works scrupulously, slowly, and with care. Let us say, after 3 years he will create a small book—he will be robbed blind and ruined utterly.

The third—the impoverishment of our publishing houses, newspapers, and journals deprives the Russian Union of Writers of receipts and grants. Our Literary Fund turns out to have no money. And those very modest social guarantees: Vouchers, clinics, etc.—all this will instantly disappear.

And the last. The Union of Writers itself, which at present is being subjected to such criticism, is disobliging to many in the world. I am convinced that, among the new leadership that has come into power in Russia, there, too, by far not all adore our Russian Union of Writers. If all the grants disappear, if the money for the maintenance of the apparatus disappears, the Union will cease to be some kind of refuge for all of us.

I would like to direct your consciousness and your feeling to this real threat. Perhaps, we do not yet realize that we are already captives. We pronounce astonishing words, we make lofty speeches, but we are captives, we are hostages!

What is to be done in these conditions? There are a few variants of conduct. As far as writers are concerned, our basic task is the immediate, present-day commercialization of our work. We must immediately become merchants, businessmen, we must at once create among us in the Union a group of economists, a group of lawyers, and a group of entrepreneurs, establish contact with the manufacturers of paper, and create paper concerns. And the main thing—saturate our association with people

who can count kopecks, who are able to compete with our opponents in transactions.

If all this does not happen, if by the fall we do not succeed in creating among us an efficient commercial center, the result of this will be the quick and perhaps irreversible degradation of our provincial culture, the degradation of our national literatures.

I say once again: There are no leaders, no merchants, no Stolypins, Pozharskiys, and Minins! And this is no joke! Our opponents have a multitude of them. They have energy, recommendations, and enormous amounts of money. We are sinking in estimation.

We need a plenum that would immediately introduce our Russian merchants into the structure of the Writers' Union.

And so, let's get down to business, friends!

A. D. Znamenskiy, Writer (Krasnodar), Member of the Yedineniye Initiative Group

Our discussion has long ago transcended the limits of literature and art. And it could not be otherwise. Valentin Rasputin is right, who said that what may happen is that talented books will not be read by anyone. 73 years ago, the advocates of universal equality almost convinced the mass (in the main—workers, but at that time a relatively small part of the people) of the indisputable truth: "Here we will throw off the tsar, and we will begin to live, they say, like people...."

The testimonies vary as to what this social experiment cost us, and the costs have in the meantime not yet been calculated.... Some demographers give a "cautious" figure—147 million victims. This figure is strongly understated, especially if we keep in mind the historical predictions of D. I. Mendeleyev. He believed that, given the rate of socio-economic development of Russia in the 1880's, our country would occupy the leading place in the world, and its population would come to...700 million!

Proceeding from the calculations of D. I. Mendeleyev in his fundamental work "Poznaniye Rossii" [The Knowledge of Russia], we are short 400 million in round figures. Of them: 100 million simply were not born, in view of, mildly speaking, "unfavorable" conditions, and 300 million were evidently destroyed. In the wars, war communism, collectivization, dekulakization, the crushes in the 1930's and 1950's, and the other genocide, which continues virtually up to now—if we keep in mind, let us say, the slow dying in the Non-Chernozem Zone and the ecological diversions from science.

And here, against the background of these "heroic achievements", a new galaxy of "engineers of economic disintegration" and social-moral obscurantism, from the same clan of thinkers who confused us with the extreme

idea 70-80 years ago, is now boiling with the same idea fixe:

"Let us throw the CPSU from the leading bridge, let us liquidate the KGB and the army, and we will begin to live better than before!"

I would not want to look like an apologist of barrack socialism, my entire biography beginning with the 17-year stay in the camps and in exile (precisely for criticizing the communist utopia) indicates something completely different. But I say: We do not need an extreme "interregnum". All the disturbances in Russia always happen during an interregnum. The party has renounced power—the Soviets have not accepted it. Here you will not have a single False Dmitriy.

Every society needs for gradual reformation and improvement. The next impetuous change of "the faith" may require of us again 300 million souls, only they already are no longer available....

The situation of our people, I think, is much worse than the situation of the Negroes in the South African Republic. The Negroes of the South African Republic distinctly recognize that they live in apartheid and discrimination, they are fighting with all their might for their freedom.

The Soviet people, even a part of the people's deputies, do not understand the initial reasons for their own misfortunes and sufferings and obediently vote for "the engineers of perestroyka". What is needed is sincere enlightenment on our part.

Here they propose to develop more activity, even economic activity—this is good. But, as we see, we have a great deal of work ahead of us, even in the ideological field.

E. I. Safonov, Editor-in-Chief of the Weekly LITERATURNAYA ROSSIYA

Impressions from a recent trip to the United States have unexpectedly become linked in me with our congress, with the questions that we are raising. I did not come away from this trip with a feeling of envy toward a rich people, I did not experience either a feeling of surprise or satisfaction that I had finally seen a society as it should be in the ideal—in the sense of the saturation of the market. The only thing which I took away for myself with still greater pain and a still more unconsoling feeling—give the people of Russia the possibility to work on themselves, for themselves, and we will have no need to catch up with and surpass the United States. In 10 years, most likely, we will not make our life worse. We will build our life on our spiritual principles.

What else I had to carry away from there in my soul are touching recollections that, very likely, inspire one with hope. This is the destruction of the myth that there is we and there is the Russian emigration, which lives, as it were, outside us. Nonsense! They are with us.

And I am talking about the first two "waves" of emigration. I saw Russian colonies in the vicinity of New York,

Washington, and San Francisco. Upon getting acquainted, I heard names that are familiar to me from literature and from our Russian life. Names of the nobility, and the most simple of names, which sounded both in Cossack and in soldier's language, as you like! I saw tens of thousands of people in love with—no, this is a light word!—people who carry in their souls an eternal, deep love for Russia.

These people—among them there are Ukrainians, Tatars, and Kalmyks—have also preserved material evidence of our history: The books of our spiritual and secular thinkers. They have not lost the nobility of the Russian language—in its full sound forgotten by us, they have preserved the sources of our theater. The center which unites them all is the Russian Orthodox Church.

And these people of Russia, when we met, declared: Give us the possibility so that everything that has remained with us does not fall into foreign hands, but rather is returned to the Homeland. We are prepared to give up everything, only there must be a guarantee that tomorrow this will not be burnt on a bonfire. This is their request, this is their voice.

And I think that, in creating our association, our movement, we must keep in mind also unification with our compatriots abroad.

Mufti Talgat Tadzhuddin, chairman of the Spiritual Administration of the Muslims of the European Part of the USSR and Siberia

We have talked a great deal. And we have spent much time on this talking-shop, and therefore today we, the greatest power in the world, nearly on our knees, are begging the entire world for a dollar each, for two or three dollars each, or for a million each. We have reached such a level that we have almost become beggars. The voice of Russia must be heard today, and we—the Muslims of Russia—welcome this congress, because literature and culture we cannot have any basis and any hope for the future.

The peoples of Russia have always loved the Most High, and never lived without God. We tried to live some part, a few decades—and what came from this is evident now. Together with the great Russian people, we will always take close to our heart the burden and anxiety, the joy and sorrow of our Fatherland. And this we have demonstrated for centuries—be it our participation in the Battle of Poltava against the Swedes, or our participation against Polish-Lithuanian occupation, or our struggle during the Patriotic War against the French invaders, or during the Great Patriotic War—always the Muslims of Russia, with weapon in hand and with a passionate heart have defended Russia.

If we want to unite in something in the future, this can only be the good and charity, but not evil and enmity. Only in this do I see the basis for the unification of the peoples of Russia. Without good and charity, I cannot imagine the monolithic character of our society and state and in general the future of mankind.

A. N. Artsibashev, Writer and Journalist

I think, I will not be mistaken if I say that in the West they now are now making conjectures about the phenomenon of long-suffering. A great people on the verge of degeneration, a great country—on the threshold of disintegration. This is perfectly well understood by the enemies of our Fatherland, they are longing for the quickest dismemberment of the state. But, unfortunately, this tragedy has not yet reached the consciousness of millions upon millions of Russian citizens. One might as well strike all the bells of the in former times numerous Russian monasteries and churches and proclaim the approaching misfortune. But the same enemies in their time worried about the fact that the voice of Orthodox Russia was silent.

Today the party is being accused of all sins: It is guilty all-around. But what is our party? It is 19 million people, the population of some states taken together. I assume that a million communists, who have elbowed their way to the commanding positions, have become parasites at the expense of the people. But what privileges did the remaining millions have, has somebody reflected on this? Does their guilt lie in the fact that the leaders of the party have at times proved to be untalented or worthless?

Let us also remember on what bayonets these leaders were raised on the pedestals of power and whether anyone elected them. It is necessary to speak the truth: The state was messed up by concrete people, and it is also concrete people who must be held responsible for the crimes that have been committed. It would be too simple to evade responsibility, having dumped everything on the party.

We know that, for the idea of "unpromising Russia," comrade Solomentsev, among others, must answer to the people, for the disintegration of agriculture—comrades Nikonorov, Murakhovskiy, and the President of the country himself; for the "wise" planning of the national economy—comrades Baybakov, Ryzhkov, and other leaders.

It seems to me that all those who guided this country until recently and were unable to do anything to lead the country out of the crisis, possessing real power, today, with imaginary power, all the more so cannot do anything, and therefore all to a man should go into retirement.

What are the paths to the renewal of Russia? I think that we all need to think about this not in a hurry, but thoroughly, and to involve scientific minds in this as well. And it is necessary today to go into the remote places, to the people, and to derive strength from there.

P. L. Proskurin, Writer, Chairman of the All-Russian Cultural Fund

Of course. To convoke our association, our congress, 30 years ago would have been very good, but it would have

even been good to convoke it a year ago, because now we are obviously late and we need to catch up.

The government and the party, indeed, have given up culture to business and to our obedient press to tear up, perhaps in order to switch attention from itself and their catastrophic mistakes something else.

And nevertheless it is very good that today the Yedineniye Association is being established. Another organic and independent force being united by the noble intention of renewing and developing national Russian culture. Already the very fact of the unification of the patriotic and cultural forces, which for many decades from the very year 1917 they tried to separate, to belittle, and to destroy, is a great blessing for Russia and its peoples, the guarantee of spiritual renewal, the unequivocal answer to the sinister mafia of universal nomads, which increasingly more persistently reaches out for the throat of Russia.

The 20th century has proved to be the most tragic in the history of our people and state. It has proved to be even more tragic for our culture, which is especially remarkable against the background of the 19th century with its unprecedented take-off of literature, the theater, and philosophy, against the background of the economic progress of Russia. Almost 70 years of the country's culture and literature were formed under the very heavy yoke of a false ideology. In painting, in cinema, as well as in music. And in history and in science as well. In socialist Russia, culture increasingly acquired the tinge of an operetta show, and here today we are reaping the bitter fruits: Disbelief and the disintegration of the national soul are present.

But the most terrible crime of Stalinist socialism is the destruction of the Russian peasant, the peasant of the Ukraine, Belorussia, and Central Asia. And when will we finally rehabilitate the millions of peasants, the so-called kulaks, but in fact the greatest toilers, ruthlessly and cynically exiled to various construction projects and destroyed there? When will we return to their children and grandchildren a faith in justice?

The Russian peasantry crucified on the cross of the revolution is not only a ghost of the past, but also our reality. History and the present are communicating vessels, and the ptomaine of the lie of the past continues to poison the souls even of those coming into the world today.

I propose to our congress to stand in silence to honor the millions of destroyed Russian peasants....

We have already talked a great deal about history. It has been robbed in our country not only of real meaning, but also by the fact that cities, squares, settlements, and even roads and almost rivers have been renamed. We, the All-Russian Cultural Fund, the Universal Cultural Fund, and the writers are fighting for the return of the age-old historical names, but the ship lies there, not moving.

I have come to the conclusion that it is necessary for any organization to materialize, to take root in production and trade, to take root in the economy, that is to possess some property, material things: Book publishing, the publication of journals and newspapers, money, their own banks, otherwise we will not break through, and all the words will remain only good wishes.

D. Dudko, Priest

The separation of church and state, I regard as an attempt to split society, to deprive our 1000-year history of its individuality, for it has its foundation in Orthodox Christianity. And this attempt failed from the very beginning. However hard the organizers tried, the state from time to time had recourse to the help of the church, without it it could not live. And now we see that we need the church again to raise our spirit, to build a moral society.

But not only for this. The church, especially at critical moments, is necessary for both believers and non-believers. You see, the church is unity. Usually we understand unity as a collective, united on the basis of personal interests. But personal interests, however good they may be, can also become egoistic. It is necessary for people to unite not simply in the struggle for worldly blessings, it is necessary for there to be higher interests. And not simply higher interests, for even from them one can break away, can one not, and fall down into the lowest of interests. What is needed is a link with that which is higher than we.

The writer Viktor Astafyev once said that we now live without a tsar in our head, without God in our soul, and for this reason there is such disorder, this is why we are separated. What can unite us? Yes, precisely the higher being. Already Dostoevsky said that if there is no God, everything is permitted. And he, like no one else, understood human psychology.

We have Russian soil under our feet, and must stand only on it. Orthodoxy is the tried and tested means which has led and will lead us out of blind alleys.

First of all, we should unite, for which we have now gathered, in order to realize our unification. But how unite, when in our society there are believers and atheists, party members and people unaffiliated with the party, democrats and partocrats. Well, throw out someone, keep someone?

No, it is necessary to keep the one and the other for the time being. It is necessary to see in every man the image and likeness of God. Our struggle must go against the spirit of evil, but not against flesh and blood—man, whether a member of the party or not, a believer or an atheist.

My concrete suggestion: To form an alliance of Russian writers and Russian priests. And we will fight together for the human soul.

E. M. Skobelev, Writer, Journalist

The Russian man—this is not a geographic and passport concept, but a moral concept. The Russian people are people of different nationalities, who have voluntarily adopted Russian culture and the Russian idea as the freest and most favorable condition for the development of the multi-tribal community, the strengthening of its distinctiveness within the framework of a new common [soborny] statehood.

We, the Russian people, are unusually sensitive to the truth. For centuries we have been searching for solutions that would suit us all and on this path we have been making unfortunate errors. Enough of the slightest subjectivism or emotional infatuation, as we protest there and then, we object to any authority. It is difficult to unite because everyone wants to serve the truth, not recognizing at times that even all together we are only on the path to it.

Intolerance, self-satisfaction, and the desire for immediate results—this is what often destroys our plans and complicates our unification. Our duty today is to completely renounce the authoritarian vanity.

Chuvash, Buryats, Yakuts, Belorussians, Kazakhs, and Ukrainians—we all must now understand that the oppression of the nationality principle is the prologue to the ruthless oppression of every one of the fraternal peoples. We strengthened by the great Russian principle, a principle of high moral standards, an age-old international principle. Without this principle, we will all scatter, and sooner or later we will fall a prey to an international predator.

The hour has come when we look at one another and everyone understands: If not today, then already never or at least without us, if we prove to be starry-eyed chatteringers and do not fortify our decisions with organized actions.

USSR Society To Combat Drug Addiction Formed 90US1237B Moscow TRUD in Russian 31 Jul 90 p 2

[Interview with Vladimir Ivanov, president of the All-Union Society for Saving Children and Juveniles From Drugs, by A. Ovcharenko: "Escape From Drugs; The USSR Has Established a Society for Saving Children and Juveniles From Drugs"]

[Text] At present, the nation has officially registered 137,000 drug users. Each year, 50 tons of these drugs are confiscated from the black market and such a figure assumes the presence of several million potential drug addicts.

[Ivanov] One out of every 10 Moscow schoolchildren has already tried drugs and the age of becoming acquainted with them has declined to 9-11 years, I was told by Candidate of Medical Sciences Vladimir Ivanov, president of the recently formed All-Union Society for Saving Children and Juveniles From Drugs.

In our nation, Vladimir Ivanov related, there is, alas, no single program for combating drug addiction. These problems are the concern of both the KGB, the MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs], the Ministry of Health and the Ministry of Medical Industry.... But each organization has its own plans and it rarely happens that the right hand knows what the left hand is doing....

Why have we become involved in the fight against drug addiction? Experience shows that its explosive growth and true epidemics have arisen in periods of social cataclysms. Take, for example, the cocaine epidemic in Europe before World War I, and in particular its manifestation among the officers of the Tsarist Army in 1914. And at present, as they say, we are in a rather troubled moment of our history.

[Ovcharenko] But the laws of the market also effect the spread of drugs....

[Ivanov] Yes, demand gives rise to supply and the profits of the drug business are enormous. The work has been skillfully organized as the drug Mafia has services which are specially employed in introducing the young people to drugs, receiving payment for this.

The juveniles do not know that the sellers of drugs or the pushers of the drug Mafia can watch them, waiting for a convenient moment to offer a sample. Or they can create such circumstances artificially. But at this time from newspaper to newspaper, article to article, one can trace the notion that people become drug addicts from pure curiosity while in fact what is being felt is the imperative of the market and profits. And so.... I know a father who gave drugs to his 11-year-old daughter. He has spent 25 years out of his 40 behind bars for the same drugs.... It is essential to realize that the drug addicts have a barrier against viable contact with others and they can be comfortable only in their own environment, among others similar to them. And they try to make this circle exist and even expand by any means....

[Ovcharenko] Many nations are adopting national drug combating programs. How would you assess the efforts of our state in this area?

[Ivanov] You must realize that if one speaks about the state scale, then it would be at least sinful to call them efforts. For instance, the most widely consumed sleeping pills up to 1989 were not considered narcotic. Or how can we understand the recently appeared separation into drug addicts and substance abusers? Why, it might be asked, are the addicts who consume certain definite substances called differently and thus removed from the action of the Ukase of the Supreme Soviet on compulsory treatment? To whom has it been advantageous to rename a portion of the drug addicts and thereby reduce their overall—and on paper—numbers in the nation?

Or what should one think about the following: 15 years ago I turned to the Ministry of Health and the Ministry of Medical Industry with a proposal to change the packaging of morphine as at that time it was kept in

ampules which could easily be softened in an ordinary alcohol lamp, in secret in the lab, and then reclosed, having replaced the drug with water. Did the medical personnel do this? Judge for yourselves: 60 percent of the young women suffering from morphine addiction and who are serving sentence for illegal involvement with drugs is nurses.

[Ovcharenko] As is known, we are unable to find anonymous treatment for drug addiction even with a sincere desire to get over the illness.

[Ivanov] And that is a bad thing. What happens to a drug addict if he comes in voluntarily to register? Immediately he is registered at the psychoneurological and narcological outpatient clinics for a period of at least five years. This is a serious violation of rights. All drug addicts are perfectly aware of this. And many of them would like treatment, but there have been so many barriers created which prevent such a step.

In the society headed by V. Ivanov, the programs are rather extensive. The main thing is exhaustive information. The children should be able to correctly identify a drug addict as a specialist can from 30 paces from his walk, gestures, glance, movement, and posture.... The children should know what danger a drug addict can be for them, aside from introduction to drugs. They certainly can end up a "guinea pig" (a concept from the drug addict dictionary) on which they can test the action of an unknown or homemade substance. It is also possible to become the victim of robbery as 80 percent of the apartment thefts not involving a break-in were committed by drug addicts. Why? You must realize that the daily dose of a drug addict with a "long habit" is presently 200-300 rubles. And where can this be sought?

One drug addict in a year can involve from five to 17 persons in the infamous circle of drug addiction. And what would this figure be for the 137,000 officially registered ones? It is possible to estimate.

The Society for Saving Children and Juveniles From Drugs is to open up anonymous consultation offices, organize the work of "telephone hotlines" for those who have fallen into a stressful situation, organize rehabilitation centers for patients and rehabilitation communes for those who themselves have given up drugs, as well as recovery camps for children of the risk groups. We ourselves will organize the production of printed, audio and video materials with an antidrug message, conduct scientific research and, what is particularly important, train specialists for working with children and juveniles. The program for their training has been given as a gift to the society by U.S. colleges which represent the charitable fund "Children—Special Beings."

The society already has affiliates in Leningrad, Kuybyshev, Ashkhabad, and Yerevan and one is being established in Krasnoyarsk. There are five co-workers in Moscow and at times other specialists work under contract. But, it should be said, abroad such activities are

the concern basically of public organizations, movements and charitable funds who have voluntarily taken up this difficult work.

...It is important to know about the harm from drugs. And it is also important to help those who want somehow to escape from them. If you need to, call the Society for Saving Children and Juveniles From Drugs. Its telephones in Moscow are: 299-15-02, 299-15-03.

AIDS Problem Viewed as Growing in Volgograd

*90US1237A Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA
in Russian 4 Aug 90 p 4*

[Article by M. Verzhba from Volgograd: "The Callousness of Officials Kills Patients Faster Than AIDS"]

[Text] Seemingly, quite recently the newspaper published the article "Cruelty. Anti-AIDS in the Volgograd Style" (RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA, 21 April 1990). This described the critical situation which had arisen in the city over the spread of this illness. Three months have passed since the publishing of the article. This is not such a short time. Have things moved since then? Have things changed?

The answer is exactly nothing has been done. In truth, there were conversations and these were held at the highest Volgograd levels in the sessions of the oblast and city soviets.

And what was the result? They were horrified and instructed the executive committee to seek out quarters for a center to combat AIDS. So the question was seemingly solved in paper. But only on paper. During that time, the homeless center which was moved out upon demand of the public from Voroshilovskiy Rayon still did not have quarters. In addition, the head position was sent on leave by the oblast public health office and the position has been sent on a trip. Now, instead of a center, there are merely decrees which do not make the infected and sick children any better.

Incidentally, about papers. The deputy head of the oblast public health department, A. Karpachev, showed me a curious document. The second session of the Kirovskiy Rayon Soviet decreed: "in following Article 23 of the USSR Law 'On General Principles of Local Self-Administration and the Local Economy in the USSR' not to give agreement to the acceptance of HIV-infected and AIDS patients in the Kirovskiy Maternity Association." There were a signature and seal.

Hence, they have decided that there is no place in the hero city for the infamous disease. But what is going to happen to the patients?

In the oblast center alone, there are almost 20 infected children who need better living conditions. It is a question of new apartments, better nutrition and good care.

Is it because of our poverty or is it because the callousness of the public and the officials at times kill more quickly than AIDS.

Volgograd needs an oblast center like the very air it breathes as how else can it support the unfortunate ones who are already infected and, let me remind the reader, at present there are more than 50 of them.

Tatyana Konstantinovna Berdikov, the oblast chief pediatrician, in describing the existing situation, was constantly amazed at the complacency of the leaders. But Karpachev summed it up:

"We all live according to the old rules of waiting for a disaster to strike and then we rush to take measures as an emergency. We must go on the offensive but we are merely defending ourselves weakly."

We need not wait for the disaster as it has already come in through the door. Are not four dead children a tragedy? Are not scores of infected children a misfortune? And the figures increase with every passing month. We go on talking and there is a flood of useless circulars. It was as if AIDS could be conquered by them. But what arguments are needed for the cry of desperation to be heard by those who should take the measures?

I would like in the near future to be able to tell the readers of RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA about the opening of Volgograd of an oblast center to organize the fight against AIDS. Will this come to be?

Health Minister on Reforms in Public Health System

*90US1205A Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Jul 90
Second Edition p 4*

[Interview with USSR Minister of Health I. Denisov by N. Gogol and I. Mosin: "Why a Market for Health Care"]

[Text] *We did not come empty handed to our meeting with the new USSR Minister of Health. A voluminous package of letters is evidence of the great and quite understandable concern that our readers have about health care. This package made it easy to specify the main themes of the discussion. The state of contemporary medicine, problems with pharmaceuticals, incentives for high quality work by doctors—these are some of the questions most frequently encountered in mail to the editors. So, here are the words of USSR Minister of Health I. Denisov.*

[N. Gogol, I. Mosin] As a rule, every new manager begins with an inventory of the operation handed over to him by his predecessor. What is your evaluation of the condition of the "operation" known as "Soviet health care"?

[I. Denisov] I think that today Soviet health care is by no means experiencing the best of times. There are many reasons for this, the primary one being the principle of

financing. Our health care system remains one of the few in the world that depends exclusively upon 100 state budget financing. Now, when the country is converting to a market economy, this system has become a hindrance. The little more than three percent allocated from the state budget is not sufficient to plug the numerous holes in health care.

The problem is that the principle of free and universal health care announced in the years of Soviet rule was later transformed into the conviction that this did not cost much; health care became almost the poorest sector. In all other countries it costs the state a great deal. The residual principle for financing medical services is the root of the evil. It is the cause of the queues at outpatient clinics, the shortage of medicines, the hard-heartedness of doctors and, finally, the mass of people dissatisfied with our medical system.

On the other hand, doctors have well justified demands from society. In all countries medical workers are among the highest paid categories of citizens. Here, however, the average wage in the sector is 30 percent lower than the countrywide average. About 300,000 medical workers need "rapid improvement in their housing conditions." In other words, they actually do not have roofs over their heads.

A whole series of measures, including the conversion to principles of health insurance, is directed towards overcoming this situation.

[N. Gogol, I. Mosin] Health insurance in our country—is this a copy of health insurance in the West, or is it something new? What are the stages and characteristic features of its introduction? What role will the average person play?

[I. Denisov] I think it is understandable that, just as there is no single drug which will cure stomach disorders and high blood pressure, there is no single universal and optimal model of health care. Therefore, it is naive to assume that we can introduce an exact copy of the Swedish, Canadian, or American systems and have the right results. Incidentally, the Americans warn us that their health insurance system is beginning to experience difficulties because of the large number of insurance companies competing in America, each of which is trying to expand its market and influence by offering preferential services. In the final account, the premium payers suffer.

I think that, paradoxical as it may sound, in our system health insurance and the principle of Soviet health care could be an optimal combination making it possible to retain free and universal medical services.

What do I have in mind? There will be deductions for working people's insurance policies, but they will not come from workers' pockets, as happens in other countries, but from enterprise incomes.

Good, you say, but what about the nonworking part of the population: children and pensioners? Here state budget financing is necessary. It should account for about half of health care financing. Understandably, state investment in the development of the sector should not decline, it can only increase.

What would such a system provide if it were approved by the USSR Supreme Soviet and the government? Above all, at a minimum there would be a doubling of health care financing. The next result is equally important. In recent years there has been much talk about preventive health and about a healthy lifestyle. Unfortunately, in most cases these discussions remain only good intentions. Because there are practically no incentives for it, the prestige of good health is in decline.

Everything would change if enterprises were to pay for the treatment of workers out of their own pockets. The management of the enterprise and the entire collective would have an interest in the health of workers. Imagine this situation. A worker is hired by a plant. His wages are 250 rubles. He is told that in addition to his wage, 10 percent, that is, 25 rubles, will go to pay an insurance policy. In a year about 300 rubles will be paid to this policy. Assume that during the year the worker is not on sick leave once. The money for the insurance policy will not have been spent. To create incentives for good health, the worker will be given, as a 13th or 14th paycheck, 50 to 70 percent of his policy.

Here is the answer to your question about what the average person gains from the introduction of health insurance. Firstly, he obtains higher quality medical services. Secondly, he has a direct interest in maintaining his health. As I have already said, the non-working part of the population will remain under state care.

When will the conversion to health insurance begin? We, medical workers and economists, are now trying to present the USSR Supreme Soviet and the USSR Council of Ministers with a first draft of the health insurance system by September. I assume that it will be widely discussed because it affects practically everybody.

[N. Gogol, I. Mosin] Igor Nikolayevich, today everything is not quiet in the doctor's office. A strike committee has been created in Leningrad and a coordinating committee is operating in Moscow. What is your evaluation of this situation? What is the cause of doctors' dissatisfaction? Won't patients suffer as a result? What role does the ministry intend to play, that of a third party arbitrator or an antagonist?

[I. N. Denisov] Neither one. In my opinion the ministry should do everything it can to protect the interests of workers in the sector. The contradictions between medical workers and society have deep roots. They have grown for decades and now, when everything is changing, it is quite natural that doctors would begin to fully voice their demands, which, I would say, are to a great extent legitimate.

Quite a bit has already been done. A month ago we solved the problem of so-called nonpaid night duty. On 11 June the State Committee for Labor and Wages and the AUCCTU [All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions] approved a decree on improving the organization of pay and on introducing new conditions for paying health care workers. In particular, this provides for paying for night duty and house calls. With the exception of administrators, the ceiling on extra earnings will be removed for everyone.

However, I think that this is only the beginning. We have now begun the development of a fundamentally new concept for evaluating doctors' work. This will make possible a significant step beyond the notorious system of guaranteed wages. The final pay received by each worker in the sector will depend upon the results and quality of work. Average earnings for medical workers should not be less than the countrywide average.

[N. Gogol, I. Mosin] Many people want to be treated in foreign countries. To be frank, this is due, not only to the increasing advertisements of Western medicine in the press, but also to reduced trust in our own. However, should there be a way to regulate this process? For example, in Hungary, if it is impossible for a patient to receive treatment within the country, he is sent abroad at the expense of the state. What is the present and future policy on this in our country?

[I. Denisov] I should point out that our state has provided money for sending patients to foreign countries. However, this is spent in the main for members of socially unprotected groups—primarily children. Patients are sent abroad if doctors recommend it. The ministry does not make this determination. The decision is made by the main centers for the types of disorder the patient involved has—heart disease, respiratory problems, organ transplants, etc. These centers determine whether, because of the seriousness or unusual nature of the illness, it cannot be treated within the USSR. Only when it cannot be is a decision made about sending the patient abroad.

For example, among the countries of Eastern Europe we were the first to perform kidney transplants. We now perform about 600 such transplants annually. Nevertheless, last year some people were sent abroad for this procedure. Why was this done? I remember one patient, a young student from the Medical Institute in Tbilisi. He had several problems: congenital diabetes, that is, pathology of the pancreas, and renal insufficiency. This required the simultaneous transplantation of the kidneys and pancreas. Such a procedure can be performed by only one clinic in the entire world, which specializes in it. Therefore, we sent him there.

Presently a genuine boom is taking place in treatment abroad, even for the illness of bronchitis. Leaving aside the question of the advisability of this practice, let us look at the real possibilities. Today the Ministry of Health now allocates only 400,000 dollars for these

purposes. In the West a bone marrow transplant costs 60,000 to 80,000 dollars. A kidney transplant costs about the same, while heart surgery costs about 50,000 to 60,000. With the money we have available we could not send more than 10 people abroad. Of course, this does not solve the problem.

Therefore, a great deal of attention is being given to the development of our own centers. We have specialists capable of performing complex operations on the heart, kidneys and liver. Their numbers will increase.

On the other hand, there are people who have their own money to spend on treatment abroad. There are enterprises that are prepared to spend their foreign exchange on treatment for their workers. We will accommodate such cases.

[N. Gogol, I. Mosin] How is the medicine shortage being handled?

[I. Denisov] The obvious fact is that the country does not have its own pharmaceutical industry. This is the main point. Present day production operations, often obsolete, can provide only about 50 percent of our needs.

What is now being done to solve the medicine problem? Firstly, there are discussions about the participation of foreign firms in the construction of four "turnkey" pharmaceutical plants. One of them will produce high quality insulin; a second—modern antibiotics; and a third—synthetic hormones (right now we do not have a single domestically produced modern synthetic hormone) and a fourth will produce medicines for heart disorders.

Secondly, we have begun to make wide use of joint enterprises. Of course, this requires the appropriate material base. We found a quite unexpected problem. Our pharmaceutical industry has about 80 factories. They are primarily engaged in simple, routine work—making various tinctures, the simplest medicines. Most importantly, they are working at only 70 percent of capacity. Thus, there are considerable reserves for increasing the production of medicines. After putting idle capacity to work and employing people, we want to open small flow lines at these factories, starting with the simplest operations—repackaging purchased medicines. This will make it possible to purchase much more medicine for the same price. Then, gradually improving our manufacturing processes, we can convert to the purchase and then to the manufacture of substances. Thus, there is a realistic way to reduce the medicine shortage in the immediate future.

[N. Gogol, I. Mosin] Recently there has been much talk about disposable syringes. They are necessary for preventing AIDS and other infections. Medical workers write that scarificators have suddenly disappeared. These are small metal devices used to pierce the finger to take blood samples. Why are the simplest instruments disappearing?

[I. Denisov] With regard to throwaway syringes they are, of course, not a panacea for all problems. Nevertheless, even this somewhat partial problem is being wretchedly solved. According to the World Health Organization the annual per capita consumption of disposable syringes is 20. That is, we now need about 6 billion such syringes. What is the situation for 1990? This year 1.8 billion throwaway syringes should be produced; however, we have reached only less than 50 percent of the planned figure. In my view the only reason for the lagging is the lack of a single producer of this product. The Ministry of the Medical Industry, the Ministry of General Machine Building and... nobody specifically is responsible for the production of disposable syringes.

What happens in such a situation? The production of multiuse syringes has declined by a factor of two to three, and expendable items have started to disappear. Having obtained independence, industrial enterprises have begun curtailing the production of items that do not return large profits. Last year the Krasnogvardets Plant in Leningrad eliminated 180 medical technology items from its product list. These include the simplest instruments: hemostats, intravenous feeding equipment, scissors. There is a similar situation for scarificators.

In my opinion, these are the costs of an outdated system of enterprise and agency monopolies in the production of various items. There is no competition between plants producing similar items. Therefore, instead of trying to reduce the price of their product by improving manufacturing techniques, etc., they are only concerned about increasing it. We should be thinking about not becoming hostages to production monopolies in our sector as we make the transition to a market economy.

[N. Gogol, I. Mosin] The public is seriously concerned about the quality of food products. What is the Ministry of Health doing about this?

[I. Denisov] Unfortunately, today we are one of the few countries that do not list the composition of food products. The exceptions are some dairy products; for example, kefir, where the content of fat, sugar, protein and other components is listed on the package. You will not find such listings of contents on sausage, cheese or other products made in our country. It seems to me that we should talk about improving production standards. This has first priority.

Furthermore, you have, of course, noted that we have very few low sugar items. Industry, interested in increasing product prices, puts in more sugar than needed, apparently thinking that the more sugar the better. We know, however, that salt and sugar are "white poisons" that help create health problems. This means that we should introduce stricter standards that take into account medical requirements for food products. These must be unconditionally observed.

In all developed countries food and medical product quality is controlled by special committees directly subordinate to parliament and not to the government. This is independent state control.

Here this function has been reduced to the agency level. I do not want to belittle the role of the Pharmacology and Pharmacopeia Committee at the USSR Ministry of Health. However, even when it rejects a given product, the situation remains at the agency level; it does not receive the necessary political airing nor does it result in state sanctions against specific enterprises. This means irresponsible and, at times, illegal actions.

The need for an independent control organ will be even greater with the transition to market relations; there will probably be more enterprises competing in the production of foods and medicines. In this case state control is extremely important to prevent situations where, for example, cooperatives have sold confectionary items unfit for consumption or olive oil heavily diluted with ordinary sunflower oil. This involves the responsibility of society for people's health.

[N. Gogol, I. Mosin] The future of health care depends upon science working together with medicine. Many medical science institutions are in the second category with regard to scientists' pay. Will this situation change?

[I. Denisov] This involves more than science. Medical schools are divided by category: first, second and third. To be in the first category, an institute must have at least 3,500 students. If it has fewer, it is in the second or third category. This determines pay and other questions.

When I showed an interest in the categories of medical scientific research institutes nobody could tell me why a given institute was in a given category. After our last reorganization there was a sharp increase in the number of institutes in the first and second categories. Could science have changed so radically in a year and a half to two years?

I think that the category of an educational institution should be determined by the quality of teaching and education.

Science should be unified. There cannot be first and second grades of scientists. A scientist should be evaluated on the basis of work and output quality. As for the institutes themselves, we must move to financing based upon competitive ratings.

[N. Gogol, I. Mosin] What are your scientific interests? What diseases does Doctor N. Denisov treat?

[I. Denisov] My candidate's dissertation was on direct blood transfusions. My doctorate was about patients suffering from cardiac ischemia. Recently I worked in Ryazan, where I was head of the surgery department. I performed operations, treated patients and taught.

Now I am working with my last graduate students from Ryazan. Of course, I will have to leave this work. It is

impossible to combine organizational and scientific work. I seriously doubt if it possible to successfully combine administrative activities with scientific work or, say with surgery. Imagine, I operate on a patient and the next day he has some sort of pain. When the doctor is near by the causes can be found, but if he is at a conference or meeting, then what? Therefore, I think that a person should fully dedicate himself to one thing. Surgery should not be a hobby. True, I try to keep up with the latest achievements in surgical theory and practice.

[N. Gogol, I. Mosin] Along these lines, what are your hobbies?

[I. Denisov] Of all the things for which I have time, I love my car. I do not get tired behind the wheel and could drive to my heart's content.

[N. Gogol, I. Mosin] What is your attitude towards medical cooperatives?

[I. Denisov] I believe in them. I think that they have a right to exist. However, how they are organized is another manner.

What has happened here? Our health care has its strong and weak points. The people who work there know them and actively use them. However, the weakness of the current cooperative movement is that it is developing in isolation from the existing treatment system. Cooperatives should not contradict this system, but supplement it. What do we have now? Say, for example, a patient has a CAT scan at a cooperative. The diagnosis shows that the patient needs further treatment. Then what? This requires medicine, a hospital room and staff. Is the cooperative able to provide all this to the patient?

I am all for the creation of a treatment chain and for cooperatives having their place in it. I do not agree with the viewpoint that only self-seekers have entered cooperatives. There are such individuals there, but for the most part these are our colleagues, only with more initiative and business skills. Now, when it is possible to utilize their potentials, they are doing so.

In short, there should be reason and understanding both on the part of treatment institutions and cooperatives. Cooperative members should not be too mercantilist, while administrators should understand the interests of the other side. Finally, it is necessary to bring order into pricing. If prices are at the cost accounting level than I think that there should be no actions against the cooperatives.

[N. Gogol, I. Mosin] What is your attitude towards folk medicine?

[I. Denisov] Most positive. That it remains at the folk medicine stage is another thing. For some broth or tincture to have an effect a great deal depends upon how it was made, upon the water, concentration and how many times it is used.

With more attention, in our difficult time folk medicine could be of considerably more service to society. All the best in folk medicine should be taken, studied and put to use treating patients. Then herbs and roots will not only be sold by grandmothers at markets, but will also be available at state pharmacies. Incidentally, an Institute for Folk Medicine has already been set up in Kiev. There are proposals to open several folk medicine pharmacies in Moscow.

[N. Gogol, I. Mosin] You supported the television seance by Kashpirovskiy. What is your position now?

[I. Denisov] Kashpirovskiy is in fact a doctor. If one may so put it, his seances are legal. We agreed with Kashpirovskiy that he would take five groups of ill people with various diagnoses. We would write his comments on a card and show it to the ill person, keeping track of how he feels. We would from this experiment; we will think about how to put his abilities to people's use. Unfortunately, there is practically no way we can implement this idea. Kashpirovskiy is supposedly not opposed, but he always has something else to do or trips to take. In the meantime we will wait.

[N. Gogol, I. Mosin] What is the fate of the Fourth Main Administration?

[I. Denisov] The Fourth Administration no longer exists as such. We obtained ten sanitaria from it. This year we turned over all ten to the children of Chernobyl and to people who participated in liquidating the consequences of the accident at the Chernobyl AES [nuclear electric power station]. Children are already in these sanitaria.

Starting next year eight of these sanitaria will remain at the disposal of children. The one in Zheleznovodsk and the one in Matsosta will, apparently, be reprofiled to treat specific illnesses. Hospital Number One on Michurinskii Prospect in Moscow will be reorganized into the All-Union Diagnostic Center.

[N. Gogol, I. Mosin] Two years ago, after the accident at Ufa, we talked with you about the need to have medicine for extreme situations in the country. What has changed since then?

[I. Denisov] There is now a USSR Council of Ministers decree on organizing medicine for extreme situations. The main center will be set up at the Surgery Institute imeni Vishnevskiy. Five branches will be organized around the country. At the Ministry of Health work is completed on a control panel with 24 hour a day staffing. At any time the news of a calamity may arrive and we will immediately set the needed forces to work dealing with it. In general, the ice has been broken.

Minister Details Armenian Health Issues, Quake Recovery Progress

90US1267A Yerevan KOMMUNIST in Russian
24 Jul 90 p 2

[Interview with A. Aznavuryan, Armenian SSR Minister of Health, by G. Sarmakeshyan: "Awaiting Changes for the Better"]

[Text] Naturally, all of us are concerned about health care. What is being done to improve the standards of medical services to the population of the republic? What are the most urgent problems? Are there any positive tendencies? Our correspondent G. Sarmakeshyan, posed these questions to A. Aznavuryan, the republic minister of health.

[G. Sarmakeshyan] Artashes Vartanovich, are any structural changes planned for the health care system?

[A. Aznavuryan] We were faced with a mass of unsolved problems, many of which were caused by imperfections in the organization of medical services. One of them is the acute shortage of hospital beds. We are last in the country with regard to this indicator. However, the difficult economic conditions in the republic gives no basis for assuming that this question will be solved in the immediate future. But this is only part of the problem. It is no secret that our sick people turn to doctors in outpatient clinics more to get a sick certificate than to obtain actual medical help. If seriously ill, a person is sent to a hospital. This is not accidental, but the result of the lack of modern equipment in outpatient clinics and the basically insufficient qualifications of the doctors working there. However, hospitals, where there are higher equipment and professional standards, also cannot fully perform their functions. According to established norms, a patient going to a hospital, stays an average of 18 days, during which it is necessary to do all tests, make the diagnosis, carry out the treatment. Given our overloaded hospitals, this is basically impossible.

This is a very sad picture—a patient's visit to an outpatient clinic is more of a formal nature, while a visit to a hospital also does not lead to a complete cure. Huge amounts are spent on this. An empty bed in a hospital costs 3 rubles 80 kopecks a day, if it is occupied by a nonworking patient it costs 6 rubles and if occupied by a working patient—42 rubles. After keeping a patient in the hospital for the stipulated time, and spending at least of 756 rubles on this, we classify him as being incompletely treated, and sometimes as not having a finalized diagnosis. By no means all patients need hospital observation. Therefore, we decided to organize a system of diagnostic and treatment work copied after the developed countries, where, incidentally, there are better results even though patients do not spend so long in hospitals as they do here. Even for the most difficult surgery and serious illness such as infarctions, patients do not remain in the hospital more than 10 days. Those countries have high levels of preclinical help and intensive care at hospitals.

Using the experience of our foreign colleagues, we decided to create specialized outpatient clinics with modern equipment for all tests and to organize and extensively use day hospitals at these clinics. This will create conditions for improving the professional standards of doctors and for making maximum use of equipment. Also, it will improve the psychological comfort of patients, who will avoid having to stay in depressing hospital wards. The material and technical potentials of hospitals can be then more effectively used for those who really need hospital care.

[G. Sarmakeshyan] Are all these only plans for the future or have specific steps already been taken to implement the program?

[A. Aznavuryan] In some outpatient clinics in Yerevan day hospitals have already been opened and diagnostic capabilities expanded. Interrayon diagnostic departments equipped with endoscopes and ultrasound equipment are being created. Such medical institutions are already functioning in Indzhevan, Leninakan and Kafan.

[G. Sarmakeshyan] Are there priority directions for health care in the republic?

[A. Aznavuryan] Protecting the health of mothers and children remains our first concern. The work already done has reduced infant mortality to 17.8 [per 1,000?]. A medical aviation service has been organized at the republic children's hospital. Mobile pediatric reanimation teams, some of which deal with infectious diseases, have been created. Pediatric first aid teams have been organized in Artashatskiy, Abovyan and Echmiadzinskiy rayons. There are more pediatric beds in hospitals in Yervan and rayons in the republic. A republic pediatric gastroenterological hospital has been set up at the site of the dachas formerly owned by the 4th Administration of the Council of Ministers. Measures have been taken to improve medical help to pregnant women and women in labor. A department for reanimation and intensive therapy, with a mobile team, has been set up at the republic maternity house. Family planning offices have appeared. However, it is still too early to consider the situation satisfactory. Maternity houses and pediatric hospitals still are experiencing an acute shortage of beds and conditions at many institutions do not meet requirements.

[G. Sarmakeshyan] Our citizens frequently complain about "fast aid" services. What can you say in this regard?

[A. Aznavuryan] I think that these complaints only concern waiting time, and this is only in Yerevan. In the past two years the population of the republic capital has increased sharply. Also, the stressful situation is conducive to cardiovascular disorders and has made many chronic illnesses more acute. Naturally, there are more calls for help. The "fast aid" works under a colossal load and therefore cannot always handle its duties. Measures have already been taken to normalize the situation. In 1990 a "fast aid" association was set up in Yerevan, the

number of specialized teams was increased and 25 more vehicles were obtained. The Ministry of Health has worked out and presented a draft of a decree on improving "fast aid's" work. I would like to point out one disturbing fact. The theft of medical vehicles continues in the republic. I want to use this opportunity to appeal to representatives of informal organizations to return stolen vehicles. They are needed to provide emergency help to our fellow citizens.

[G. Sarmakeshyan] Coarse indifference about patients has literally become the norm at our medical institutions. What is being done to put a stop to these shortcomings?

[A. Aznavuryan] Unfortunately, the ethical standards of our health care leave much to be desired. The lack of civility and of a benevolent attitude towards patients is sometimes seen in medical workers at all levels. This is intolerable. Therefore, the Ministry of Health must issue an order requiring the strictest measures be taken to assure the psychological comfort of patients.

[G. Sarmakeshyan] Are medical institutions satisfactorily equipped?

[A. Aznavuryan] Undoubtedly not. The lack of the latest equipment delays the introduction of modern medical techniques. True, the situation has improved somewhat recently. As a result of assistance from foreign states, we have a sizable number of artificial kidney machines, making it possible to open an additional hemodialysis department for adults and one for children, the only one in the country. A republic center for lithotripsy has been created to break up kidney stones. It is based at the Urology Department at Hospital No 1. Modern diagnostic equipment has appeared. Nevertheless, we have a shortage of modern equipment in practically all areas of medicine. Another problem is that the equipment available is not always used to its maximum effect. This is because of insufficiently trained doctors and improperly organized medical assistance. However, I am confident that the implementation of the program mentioned at the beginning of our interview will overcome these shortcomings. Of course, it is necessary to rapidly solve economic problems in our society, to technically modernize health care and to give it the ability to utilize modern science.

Work is under way to create a medical industry.

[G. Sarmakeshyan] How many patients in Armenia are sent to other republics for treatment?

[A. Aznavuryan] Their number has declined considerably. New urological, cancer and cardiological operations have been mastered, there has been a considerable upgrading of angio- and microsurgery. Ophthalmologists have been very successful, as a result fewer people suffering from such disorders were sent for treatment in other republics.

[G. Sarmakeshyan] Our citizens are concerned about sanitation conditions in urban buildings and in trade and food service enterprises. To what extent is this justified?

[A. Aznavuryan] Sanitation in the republic is very unsatisfactory. I do not want to put it on too thick, but the condition of water and sewer pipe systems and of trade and food service enterprises is such that at any time there could be an epidemic, even a cholera epidemic. Urban houses are full of garbage and huge numbers of rats.

The work of the food industry remains unmonitored; the trade in uninspected meat continues. Understandably, our ministry cannot solve these problems on its own. This requires coordinated efforts by city and rayon soviets, various ministries and agencies and sanitation services. It is also necessary to raise the consciousness and standards of our citizens.

[G. Sarmakeshyan] As far as I know, the Ministry of health had systematic ties with Artsakh and with Armenian villagers in Azerbaijan. Tell me about this in detail.

[A. Aznavuryan] Our Ministry has been fully concerned about the health of the Armenian population living there. The health conditions of people in the NKAO [Nagorno Karabakh Autonomous Oblast] and in Armenian villages in Azerbaijan are very unsatisfactory. There are not enough specialists. Medical institutions are poorly equipped. The Armenian Ministry of Health has helped set up a modern equipped diagnostic center in Stepanakert. Between December 1989 and the present day more than 100 doctors and 1.5 million rubles worth of medical equipment have been sent to Shaumyanskiy Rayon, Getashen and the NKAO. Medical and consultation assistance is being provided. Medical institutions in Armenia freely accept patients from the NKAO and Armenian villages in Azerbaijan.

[G. Sarmakeshyan] In view of the stress and instabilities experienced by many refugees it is easy to see that they need special attention by health care units.

[A. Aznavuryan] The managers of all medical institutions have assumed personal responsibility for providing checkups and examinations to all refugees and for giving them complete treatment and medicines. Paramedical points have been organized where refugees live. Emergency medical services to refugees is closely monitored. Day hospitals, rayon hospitals, specialized centers, clinics and scientific research institutes in Yerevan are operating at full capacity. Managers at all treatment and preventive institutions have been instructed to eliminate all red tape hindering the provision of medical assistance to refugees.

[G. Sarmakeshyan] Has it been possible to, at least to some extent, improve health care in the disaster zone?

[A. Aznavuryan] More than 7,850 hospital beds and outpatient clinics for 13,570 visits a shift have been introduced. Rural medical institutions are operating well. Complete preventive medical examinations, and

thorough examinations by specialized teams are aimed at rehabilitating children. Associates from departments at the Yerevan Medical Institute and the Institute for Improving the Qualifications of Doctors have been enlisted into this work. Data banks on the health of children in Leninakan, Kirovakan, Spitak, Stepanavan and Akhuryan are being created. All conditions are present for giving medical help to the population in the disaster zone.

High Infant Mortality in Tajik SSR Examined

90US1229A Moscow SOYUZ in Russian No 30,
Jul 90 p 7

[Article by Lev Aleynik under the rubric "The Nation's Health": "The Children of Tajikistan: Urgent Action Is Required To Save Them"]

[Text] *In a canyon only an hour's drive from Dushanbe I was shown a rare and remarkable sight, the mere thought of which makes my blood run cold: large boulders weighing a ton or two jutting out from an unstable hill right above the maternity ward of the area hospital in the village of Kipchak. One of them has already fallen and smashed a building already almost in ruins. Luckily, there were no patients in the ward in its path.*

The 55-bed pediatric section was razed, because it had settled during an earthquake, and 15 beds were set up in the therapy section. The conditions? "You can see for yourself," chief physician Kudratullo Niyezov said, with a tired wave of the hand. "What are we to do with the others? In the entire canyon, with a population of many thousands, there is only ours and one other hospital of its kind. Four FAPs [obstetrical facilities] are in a simply disastrous state, and two are squeezed into railroad cars. There is no telephone communication, and portable radio units will not clear the mountains.

Three neighboring sovkhozes at Kipchak—not at all poor ones—have not seen fit to build a single FAP. The chief physician has gone to them more than once to pay his respects and to beg, implore, demand.... And all in vain. When a calf dies the director rouses everyone, but when it is a baby, and particularly a newborn baby, there is indifference: "What Allah gave, Allah took," they say. The many traditional marriages between relatives produce numerous pathologies. Hospitalized women are anemic and have edema from a protein deficiency. I could not say how many of them I have seen—with transparent fingers, deathly pale. I can't forget them. The shelves are empty, and families are huge, with 30 to 80 members. Their diet consists of watery vegetable soup with a cup of tea and a piece of flat bread. They eat meat a couple of times a year, at a funeral repast or on a high holiday. One would think that they could eat their fill in the hospital and get better. But no, according to Muslim customs many of them do not eat the hospital food, carefully concealing this from the personnel and making do with treats brought from home—the same old flat bread and tea.

Birth records were traditionally neglected here. We have more or less accurate figures only for the past 15 years, and not everywhere at that. Not much has changed in many villages, particularly in the remote, high-mountain areas. A steady increase in infant mortality which began back in 1968-1969 was so striking that it became the talk of the entire republic.

The causes? DDT, s,s,s-tributyltrithiophosphate ($(C_4H_9S)_3PO$), and other pesticides and herbicides, which the World Health Organization has long recognized as extremely dangerous toxic substances and whose use is incompatible with food production. It is all the more inadmissible in areas where human beings live and livestock is kept. Even in recent years, however, 59 different toxic chemicals have been brought into the republic, one more toxic than the other. There are plenty of cases of multiple poisonings. Only two years ago residents of Kommunisticheskiy Rayon, next to Kurgan-Tyube in the Vakhsh Valley, were affected. People in Kolkhozabadskiy Rayon recall how a chemical curtain hung over women working in the fields. They recounted a discussion held at that time with Kuzibayev, then chief physician at the central rayon hospital. He summoned up his courage and went to the first secretary of the rayon committee. The latter cut the defender off at the door, however, saying that Moscow was in a better position to know the situation, that it was not Kuzibayev's business. When the doctors tested blood samples from children and pregnant and nursing women, they were horrified. The iron level was 5-10 times above normal. Not until later did they learn that this was due to chemicals which had caused a massive breakdown of erythrocytes in the [blood] vessels, a hemoglobin nucleus consisting of iron was discovered....

Kolkhoz chairmen told about how, in the Vakhsh Valley, an aircraft would spray phosphoric chemicals, and pregnant women would collapse in a dead faint. It was useless to file complaints. They were growing rice. A chairman and Hero of Socialist Labor attested to this before Deputy Minister (now past) Abdushukurova. When the cotton is being worked and harvested, women are brought in in an extremely serious state, suffering from hemolysis, a blood disturbance. They have eight times less hemoglobin in their blood, and the developments in the organism are sometimes irreversible. The leadership of the USSR Ministry of Health knows of many such cases, but today, as then, they simply throw up their hands as though to say: What could we have done? What is there to say about Ivan Andreyevich Sazhenin, former Tajik minister of health who retired in 1985 after occupying that high post for almost a quarter of a century.

In January 1986 Professor Saadi-Nisso Khakimova, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Medical Sciences and honored scientist of the Tajik SSR, made these terrible facts known to the Bureau of the republic's Communist Party Central Committee. She then documented them. There were no grounds for not believing her, a woman nicknamed "mother of the nation," founder of the Tajik Scientific Research Institute for the

Protection of Motherhood and Childhood (NII OMD) and head of a department of the medical institute. Her assistants constantly visited maternity homes. One day Mirsaburova arrived from Regarskiy Rayon and laid a report on the desk. She had found some doctors engaged in an unimaginable activity: rewriting the medical histories of three newborn babies and reducing their weight and length.... The professor asked for a report to be written up in her name and for a copy to be taken to Minister Sazhenin. The latter showed the messenger the door, saying that she was a chief consultant and should herself establish order in her rayon.

Sometime later the senior obstetrician at the republic maternity home asked Khakimova whether she had heard about certain incidents at the clinic. One baby weighing 2,200 grams was turned over to the father as dead, and he took the bundle home. It was late.... The next morning they prepared the burial garment and unwrapped the little body to wash it for burial, and it let out a squeak. Another one weighing 1 kilogram and 700 grams was tossed onto the cement floor without even tying of the umbilical cord. The next day it was given to the father, who took it home, where he detected movement in it! Khakimova took three such "medical histories" to the Dushanbe procuracy, but they did nothing there. Republic procurator A. Shchelochinin subsequently sent the papers to Moscow. Back came the conclusion of the distinguished luminaries in the capital: The deaths of the babies could not have been prevented.... Khakimova risked everything, writing up all the ways to remedy the infant mortality figures and citing numerous outrages surrounding the matter, and sending the document to A.B. Chakovskiy, chief editor of LITERATURNAYA GAZETA through a reliable channel. It was not published, however. The document ended up in the hands of people in charge in the USSR Ministry of Health.

Numerous commissions were set up in the Scientific Research Institute for the Protection of Motherhood and Childhood—several dozens just in 10 years—and not one refuted the facts. She sent documents on the outrages to the KPK [Party Control Committee] of the CPSU Central Committee: More than 8,000 newborns were being destroyed each year by the illegal method of "writing off fetuses" (even more today: the population has grown). The document came to KPK worker V.S. Sevastyanov. He told her when they met that things would go bad for both of them if the papers reached Trapeznikov, head of the CPSU Central Committee's Science Department. The documents remained in the bowels of the KPK. She retained copies.

She reported the scandalous concealment of infant mortality also to the Bureau of the Tajik Communist Party Central Committee and wrote Petkel, chief of the republic KGB, and Bobosadykova, secretary of the Tajik Communist Party Central Committee., about the causes of death of a group of mothers and newborns in Yavanskiy Rayon. They did not respond, however. At least a half-million newborn babies were killed under Minister

Sazhenin, she said, and Deputy Minister Abdushukurova universally installed people capable of such acts. They should be tried. The documents were submitted to the Central Committee Buro, and Abdushukurova was removed from her position.

It is very difficult to prove that sometimes no papers are filled out on premature newborns, the births are not registered, and the babies are quietly buried as miscarriages. No traces are left in the maternity section of the local hospital.... Children who die during their first year of life are not included in the statistics; they are indicated as having died in their second year. This reduces "infant mortality." The World Health Organization has established this indicator as an extremely important criterion of a nation's socioeconomic development. The higher the infant mortality, the lower the latter. So that if there are major deficiencies in the distribution of income among various groups of the population, this indicator goes into play. Compare the lowest infant mortality (in the Baltic area) with the highest (in Central Asia). The socially guaranteed minimal health care also provides arguments and proof. In the Baltic area from 100 to 120 rubles is provided per person per year; in Leningrad, 82 rubles; in Tajikistan, 48 rubles. There is none lower.

Once, at the Gissar Maternity Home, Khakimova and some students saw three newborn babies which had turned blue, lying on a single little bed. R. Stepanova asked why they were not being treated. The nurse replied: "Oh, doctor, we can't wait for these little fetuses to die." They were weighed. One weighed two kilograms and 200 grams; another, one kilogram and 800 grams; the third, one and a half kilograms. They could have been saved, but everything possible was done to prevent babies such as these from leaving the maternity home and dying with the family.

Why are we losing full-term babies weighing more than two kilograms and perfectly viable? Babies weighing from one to 1.5 kilograms predominate in the world infant mortality structure, after all. Japanese statistics are disconcerting: They save three out of 11 "light-weight" babies weighing from 350 to 500 grams; half of those weighing 501 to 800 grams. Japanese technology is amazing, of course. The Tajik Scientific Research Institute for the Protection of Motherhood and Childhood, on the other hand, has only two ultraviolet machines, and 120,000 women have been examined with them in two shifts in 6 years. Personnel sent to the department of the First Moscow Medical Institute on temporary assignment are amazed at the multitude of machines concentrated there from various countries. And this is just a department, while it is a specialized institute in Dushanbe, the capital of a republic with a high birth rate. It is the one which should be provided with equipment if we want to reduce the disastrous mortality. This is where there is scope for the application of scientific and practical efforts. This is where a large number of babies could be brought out of it.

The segregation of the peasants continues to this day. It was not until 1987 that norms were finally set: one obstetrician>yneecologist per 10,000 rural adults, regardless of territorial services. None of the norms are in effect yet, however, because they were not backed up with the means.

This is why, after almost 70 years of Soviet power, the women of Central Asia are not aware of the existence of gynecological and obstetric assistance. And also why there is neither a maternity home nor a hospital in such large rural rayons as Gissarskiy and Leninskiy, with populations of 210,000-280,000, but only a shed with no toilets and no hot water, sometimes not even cold water. The maternity sections of the small rural, district hospitals have 18-30 beds, and two thirds of them, I repeat, are categorically subject to closure for unsanitary conditions in accordance with the recent certification.

Many women are tired of these endless pregnancies and births. But what are the unfortunate women to do? To whom can they turn for birth control pills or an IUD? Frequently there is simply no female doctor or obstetrician. There are only men at the obstetrical facilities. Custom prevents them from doing anything. If God wants it, I have to give birth.

They have managed to acquire one maternity home with enormous difficulty in the republic in 10 years. During all the years of Soviet power in Tajikistan, however, they have not seen fit to erect a single standard children's hospital. As of now, the construction of a 350-bed standard clinic in Dushanbe has not even started. It still does not exist. And back in 1974 the republic's capital construction plan included a clinic, which should long since have been saving the little children. Strangely, with respect to the causes of prenatal mortality (stillbirths and babies who die during the first seven days of life), a commission of the KPK under the CPSU Central Committee confirmed the facts and the conclusions, but there have been no changes.

Last winter a truly soulful cry resounded throughout the republic in the form of an appeal from the Scientific Research Institute for the Protection of Motherhood and Childhood to all the kolkhoz chairmen and the directors of sovkhozes and enterprises in the agroindustrial complex. The nation is threatened with extinction. The people may simply not have a future. The Tajiks have come right up to that fateful line. The scientists and physicians ask the agroindustrial complex to become a sponsor and help to outfit the institute's new obstetrical clinic with modern, imported equipment, to help with the construction of a pediatric clinic and help provide the currency....

What did the medical people receive for their appeal? I leaf through the minutes of the 20 January 1990 session of Gosagroprom [State Agroindustrial Complex] and the republic Kolkhoz Council. V. Vakhidov, first secretary of the republic Council of Ministers, and S. Sadreddinov, chairman of the Kolkhoz Council, approved the appeal,

announced a "five-year health plan" and committed themselves to provide practical assistance to the health agencies with construction and equipment, to allocate 1 million rubles annually out of the currency fund of Gosagroprom enterprises, to consider the possibility of providing financial assistance for constructing a pediatric facility for the Scientific Research Institute for the Protection of Motherhood and Childhood or allocating currency to enlist foreign firms for the construction.

This document was what was needed. Everything stopped at that point, on paper, however. The hesitation was justified, it turned out. On 29 May the republic Ministry of Health received a discouraging letter from I. Kurbanov, first deputy chairman of the Tajik Gosagroprom: "...it does not appear possible to allocate 1 million rubles for the republic health agencies in 1990."

And so, no foreign equipment will be purchased with Agroprom currency to save the children. One wonders, though: Did I. Kurbanov actually not know the agenda of that session? And why did he remain silent, when he knew that a number of promises could not be kept? Or did he foresee that in the near future the fulfillment of Gosagroprom's commitments would depend entirely upon him and that the minutes would remain nothing but hollow words on paper for a long time to come? And then, a spring session of the Tajik SSR Council of Ministers undertook a rearrangement, the reasons for which were clear to few. As soon as V. Vakhidov demonstrated a criminal readiness to pay off the debt to the true owners of the currency, he became unsuitable. A.M. Babayev was appointed chairman of Gosagroprom, and I. Kurbanov became the "master" of the currency fund. Prior to the establishment of the Gosagroprom he had been deputy minister and then minister of the republic's food industry, within which there occurred the well-known, monstrous theft of cotton oil during the period 1982-1984, written up in PRAVDA by O. Latifi.

The following reply came to a request from People's Deputy of the USSR for the construction of a pediatric clinic and an experimental children's nutrition section in Dushanbe by foreign firms and the purchase of imported equipment: "it makes more sense for republic construction agencies to build the facilities, with their subsequent provision with medical equipment purchased out of the currency which will be allocated to the USSR Ministry of Health for the period 1991-1995." Do you have a sense of what will become of target dates for construction completions effected "by us" in view of the well-known unwieldiness of the republic's construction complex, with its numerous dragged-out construction projects?

It is true that A.N. Troshin, deputy chairman of USSR Gosplan, deemed it possible this year to allocate up to 300,000 rubles in freely convertible currency. But will it be possible to purchase any of the medical equipment which is so essential? Not likely, judging from the reply from B.G. Varlamov, deputy general director of the All-Union Soyuzmedtekhnika association: "there is no

possibility of providing additional medical equipment this year, since the health system's needs are being met by only 40-50 percent. If additional funds are received or if imports are purchased, your request will be considered." So it is only going to be "considered." And who knows how long the long-suffering obstetric clinic will go without equipment, even if it is built?

Toxic chemicals, a neglected ecology, blatant poverty and the troglodytic level of our medicine—such is the cat-o'-nine-tails which is driving mothers and infants into the grave and the others toward the dead end of extinction. Is anyone ever going to need the children of Tajikistan?

Uzbek Independence, Social Problems Reviewed

*90US1209A Tashkent SOVET OZBEKISTONI
in Uzbek 13 May 90 p 3*

[Article by Ph.D. Yu. Shodimetov, "Human and Social Justice."]

[Text] The many aspects of the party's social policy as an inseparable part of the acceleration of social progress were clarified anew at the 27th CPSU Congress. As stressed in the CPSU Central Committee's political report to the congress, the level achieved in the development of Soviet society and the breadth of the new tasks set forth by the party demand a long-term, thoroughly thought-out, and powerful social policy that embraces all aspects of social life. As stated in the report: "If we can make a firm turnaround in the social field then numerous problems of today and tomorrow will be solved more quickly and effectively than they have been so far."

One of the core ideas of the 27th CPSU Congress is social justice. It is embodied in the basic principles of an active and powerful social policy. It was stated in the congress resolution adopted in regard to the CPSU Central Committee's political report: "The party will strictly observe the principle of social justice and will strive assiduously to eliminate all circumstances that impede the unstinting implementation of this principle."

In a socialist society the concept of social justice reflects both the successes achieved and the problems that need to be resolved in the social field. The unstinting implementation of principles of social justice is an important prerequisite of the unity and political stability of a society and of its stormy development.

The path of establishing social justice is not easy and smooth. There have been errors and deviations from the principles of socialism along this path.

The 27th party congress stated clearly and openly on behalf of the CPSU and the people the reasons for the difficulties and unacceptable tendencies. Among these reasons are the lack of sufficient attention to people and

the decreasing significance attached to problems of social justice and to its establishment in the daily life of the society.

Such an attitude is seen especially clearly in conditions of the Central Asian region. In many respects the state sovereignty of republics remains on paper. Their independence has been restricted when it is a question of solving important regional problems. The bureaucratic approach to problems taken by central agencies has negated objective economic laws; the laws of human, social, and natural development; the characteristics, traditions, and ways of life of nationalities; and the climatic and geographical features of the region. As a result, the region's economy was developed as an area that provides raw materials. An extreme imbalance appeared in the development and placement of production forces and the fields of social infrastructure.

These, as well as socioeconomic plans drawn up without consideration of the effects of ecological and demographic factors, led to a serious deterioration of the quality of life of the people and to its remaining seriously behind average union indices in national and per capita incomes. In cotton cultivation, the cotton monoculture and the neglect of scientifically based farming systems had a negative effect.

In the past quarter century, the share of capital funds allocated to the development of social fields of production collectives has declined steadily. In the 11th Five-year Plan, the share of production capital funds formed around 25.3 percent for all of Uzbekistan.

Various negative tendencies are on the rise in personal development. The complex of socioeconomic, ecological, and demographic factors has had a negative effect on social and biological aspects of peoples' conduct. Quality and quantity indices of the "human dimension" have deteriorated.

Research shows that the average height of the indigenous population of Central Asian republics is 3-5 centimeters shorter than the population of the European part of the country. Such changes now are especially visible among children and teenagers living in the cotton-growing areas of the Central Asian republics. Because great quantities of pesticides and mineral fertilizers are being used in these places. The chemical structure of drinking water and foodstuffs gets worse every year. Besides their lack of quality, per capita volume of consumption of food and water is regarded as lowest in the country. At the present time, 3.5 million of the rural population in Uzbekistan use canal water. Sewage and plumbing exist only in 46 of 124 cities, 15 of 97 city settlements, and 5 of 15 rayon rural centers.

Today nine million people or 45 percent of the population of our republic live in poverty. There are over one million unemployed. All of this puts pressure on social and biological aspects of peoples' lives. As a result, sickness and infant mortality increase and life expectancy decreases.

An important measure of social justice in every society is quality of life and health. However, despite modern achievements in social and scientific fields, today men live an average of 12 years less and women an average of eight years less than they did formerly. Average life expectancy in 1985 was less than in 1950 in Central Asian republics.

There is a great deal more infant mortality. 16.7 percent of the country's population lives in Central Asia and Kazakhstan. However, 28 percent of the country's children are born here, and more than 46 percent close their eyes before reaching one year of age. Today, Uzbekistan occupies 75th place in the world in infant mortality.

The level of infant mortality in a given region depends in many respects on the material and technical bases of health care, providing it with cadres, and organizing medical care for the population.

At the present time, for example, there are 76.2 spaces in hospitals per 10,000 children in Uzbekistan. The norm should be 113.7 spaces. In general, the average area per bed per child in our republic is 2.3-3 square meters. The norm is seven square meters. The status of hospitals for contagious diseases arouses particular alarm. Seventy percent of them are located in modified buildings, 20 percent lack plumbing, 65 percent do not have hot water. Over 20 percent carry in water from somewhere else.

The status of medical care for children is unsatisfactory. Despite the child birth rate in Central Asian republics there are few pediatricians. Their number is 40 percent fewer than the average union index.

Most infant mortality is integrally connected to women's health. Complex living conditions, medical care, low level of literacy, involvement of women in heavy and dangerous labor, have a negative effect on their health.

Today, nearly 200,000 women, including over 10,000 mothers, work at difficult or physically heavy labor. The work of pregnant women in cotton processing industrial enterprises has become an acute problem in the republics. As a result over 30 percent of newly delivered mothers became ill in Central Asian republics in 1988.

We must also affirm that working conditions for rural working women of the region have not changed concretely for many years. Their work is not only very hard, it is also dangerous. This has become a social (as well as an economic) problem. It is connected with the chemization of cotton. This practice is harming the atmosphere and water sources, as well as the health of women. Naturally, the health of women affects the future health of children. The administrative-bureaucratic system turned into a European craft master at harnessing the energies of people each year in the pursuit of millions of tons of cotton.

In the words of Marx, it wasted the energies and vital labor of people. It not only wasted their flesh and blood, it debilitated their nerves and brains. Marx said this

about capitalism. As it has turned out, administrative and bureaucratic socialism has also led to this.

The rise in birth rate and natural growth in the region have gone hand in hand with declining labor productivity and especially a rise in manual labor. For this reason the republics here have remained seriously behind in basic sectors of the social infrastructure, including housing construction, social services, and building of medical facilities, kindergartens, and nurseries. This is clearly seen in the profound difference in provision of hospitals between republics of the Central Asian region and other republics of the country. For example, in the period between 1970 and 1986 the difference between Uzbekistan and Latvia increased from 7.2 to 19.9 index points.

In 1985 the amount spent for health care per person was 41 rubles in Tadzhikistan, 44 in Kirgizstan, 68.9 in Estonia, 70 in Latvia, and 52 in the Ukraine. It appears that these figures are evidence of the clear violation of the simplest principles of social justice. That means that central planning and economic organs should revise their approach to regional problems of social development.

It was rightly stressed at the all-union congress of physicians that the time has come to think about normative per capita expenditures. We must distinguish between our approaches to these problems in Azerbaijan and areas of Central Asia, Kazakhstan, and the RSFSR, which have the highest birthrates, and our approaches in the Baltics, Belorussia, and the Ukraine.

Current difficulties in placing children in preschool educational establishments are restricting the potential for attracting women to socially useful labor. For this reason a quicker resolution of current socioeconomic and cultural problems in the region is required.

Under conditions of socialism the state took upon itself for the first time in history the entire responsibility for the health of the populace. The state strengthened through laws the organizational and material aspects of ensuring all economic, social, and medical measures for the care of the people's health. The party and soviet state thus indicated the future outlines for resolving the core questions of social policy.

Accordingly, it is impossible to defend proposals for changing the bases of mutual cooperation between socialist nationalities within the structure of a single Soviet state.

If this were done each nationality or ethnic group would have to solve economic and social problems, including health care problems, by itself within the boundaries of its own republic. Republics with a weak material base in the social field and with a rising birthrate could not overcome these problems at the level of their potential. Division of the interests and energies of republics, peoples, and ethnic groups in our country could lead to bad consequences not only in the social field, but also in

other respects. More accurately, it could fall as a blow to the political and economic union of nationalities. This union must not crack. It has been the basis of socialist restructuring and must remain so.

As stressed at the February 1990 plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, the current status and socioeconomic base of the republic really are not being taken into consideration today when we talk about our own currency and self-management. The socioeconomic basis of our republic is such that average salary of employees here are approximately 4.1 times smaller and per capita income nearly two times smaller than the national averages. How long can people tolerate the survival principle in the approach to meeting their needs? For those who have no income at all there should be some sort of minimum income. Under conditions of federation that is being renewed today, can we really allow any republic to remain twice as far behind in standard of living with respect to other regions?

However, practical steps in this direction have not been taken so far. In the speeches that prevailed at the second congress of USSR People's Deputies the regional aspect of economic reform was not considered adequately. Above all, this is evident in the fact that issues of the allocation of central funds for accelerating the solution of social, demographic, and economic problems of our region is not reflected in the union budget. Besides that, as USSR People's Deputies elected from the Central Asian republics pointed out, newer approaches to distribution of revenues from sale of finished products are not being reflected in budgets of the republics which produce raw materials and manufactured goods.

The socioeconomic problems reviewed above are not being overcome justly, and the complex of human and health problems which are an important factor in stimulating labor agitation remain unresolved.

Party and soviet agencies in the region must elevate demographic policy to the state level. Developing placement of the population, improving the situation of women and the elderly, formation of the family, and widespread production and implementation of socioeconomic measures for protecting and strengthening the health of the populace must take priority in this policy.

Uzbek Youth Unemployment, Illegal Labor Market Described

*90US1212A Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA
in Russian 28 Jul 90 p 1*

[Article by D. Molchanov: "What's To Sell If There's Nothing To Buy?: A Report From an Illegal Labor Exchange"]

[Text] "Whenever the neverending porridge and runny dining hall 'gruel' stuck in our throats, we went to the market.

"No, not to buy something. Even in the store you can't buy anything for the nine rubles my school gives as an allowance.

"Here in a small area unshaven men concentrate on giving off the appearance that they are just reading the newspapers. And children 14-15 years old (they make up the majority here)—that they're just 'hanging out.' At five in the morning.

"From time to time vehicles roll up to the market. 'What've you got?' asks one of the men hiding behind a newspaper. 'Garlic to plant,' replies the 'customer.' 'How much?' we ask—we're not new to this anymore, and we know quite well that we could easily earn a 25 ruble note apiece for even 'easier' work.

"We were lucky that day. We were 'bought' to cut carnations. True, there was only 10 in it for each of us, but the work was a pleasure: cutting flowers with little garden shears in a cozy greenhouse....

"From time to time, often at the peak business hour in the 'spontaneous labor exchange,' the militia vehicles appear. Sternly staring down the work-hungry men, the keepers of the peace circle the square a few times, and then go away. There's no one to chase off here: You're not going to harass people who want to read the latest newspapers or 'hang out' at five in the morning...."

V. Lobkov, 16 years.

There is no precise schedule here. Sometimes they gather together on Saturdays and Sundays, sometimes on Wednesdays, but whatever the case, the impression is that they never leave. There are days when a couple of thousand might show up, and others with barely a dozen. And what kind of schedule are you going to have, anyway? This is a market.

A market, or using the Eastern word, a bazaar. A bazaar like no other in Tashkent, but like many in Central Asia. A bazaar where they sell labor.

"Hey, man, what are you looking for?" a broker spots you as a possibility. And if you're there, you're looking for one of two things—workers or work.

One would think that there is nothing surprising in the fact that some people have to look for work in a republic in which a million and a half people "are not employed in social production." One would think that this was explainable, since according to data of the Uzbek SSR State Statistical Committee, considering growth of the work force, jobs will have to be found in the 13th Five-Year Plan for around four million people—and that's the problem. One would think that this was all to be expected if....

If behind the back of each worker at Tashtekstilmash there stood a crowd of unemployed, greeting with joyful whooping his every tiniest mistake, which might give one of these hundreds a chance to replace the poor sap at the

machine tool. If on Lenin Boulevard, next to the beautiful Blue Cupolas Restaurant, Tashkent's homeless spread their beloved newspaper VECHERNIY TASH-KENT on a hard bench and lost themselves in restless sleep after a tiring day of searching for odd jobs. If they gathered over the warm air vents beside the Friendship of Peoples Metro Station....

But nothing of the sort. The management of the Tashkent Agricultural Machinery Plant is offering its workers a bonus for every new worker they bring into the shop, the lobbies of the enterprises are plastered with "Help Wanted!" posters, lovers kiss the nights away on benches along Lenin Boulevard, and the VECHERNIY TASH-KENT—the one pleasure of the potentially homeless—is filled with job invitations.

So what's going on here? Is this just another typical paradox of our life, where a most acute shortage of working hands is experienced in practically all spheres of the republic's national economy despite a surplus of labor resources? And this is not somewhere in the Nonchernozem, where all of the young people have abandoned their dying villages; this is Uzbekistan, where the population's growth rate is triple the all-union level.

To be sure, you can call this anything you like—a paradox, an absurdity.... You might even call it the "inefficiently employed." According to estimates of specialists from the department of demography and labor productivity of the Uzbek SSR Economics Institute, there are half a million of such "inefficiently employed" in the republic. Well, at least they're employed in something, and that's good.

In a word, the jobs are out there. But apparently they are so very unattractive, especially to the young, who are perpetually offered the worst kind of jobs, and if they are going to take them, then they would at least want the working conditions to be adequate. But what is it that the republic can offer? Industry, in which 36.3 per cent of the workers, mostly young people, do manual labor, or construction, where this figure is 55 per cent? By the way, this problem is found not only in Uzbekistan, although hardly anyone would still "boast" that the republic has been and—let's be honest—remains the Union's raw material base.

Uzbekistan is raw materials, and that's where the problem lies. There are very few electrical engineering, electronic and instrument making enterprises here. There is almost no industry that processes the raw materials which are produced.

Therefore 62.3 per cent of secondary school graduates go to work in agriculture. Of course, this is also explained by the fact that more than half of the increase in the young population of Uzbekistan is in rural areas, but.... But since when does the fact that a person was born in a kolkhoz explain his great attachment to this kolkhoz? We know since when. Since the time when the practice of registration was institutionalized in the USSR. When a person is registered as a rural resident, it is almost

impossible to remain in the city even after graduating from a VUZ [higher education institution], and if there are any plants at all, they are located primarily in the cities.

The problem of employment in the republic, and especially the problem of employment of the young—the part of the society that is least ensured against the whims of the marketplace—is more important today than ever before. And Tashkent understands this. The Uzbek Komsomol Central Committee submitted its proposals to the Uzbek SSR Supreme Soviet in this regard, the Council of Ministers is working to implement its "Employment" program, and the republic's Communist Party Central Committee also has its ideas concerning this problem.

But in the meantime the number of unemployed from 18 to 29 years old is growing. In some oblasts the proportion of young people among the unemployed reaches 60 per cent.

And that's when the individual remembers the labor market.

We all know that despite the socialist planned economy, a market has always existed in our country. Being "a thing unto itself," it has operated without any kind of controls on the part of the state, adhering only to the eternal law of supply and demand. The same goes for the labor market. It has existed in Tashkent since prerevolutionary times, and apparently it has never stopped functioning. And why?—the answer is simple: The demand is there. There are people who need money, and there are people ready to pay.

This is a market of day labor. It does not fit within the framework of our recent ideology, according to which one man's exploitation of another is said to be the root of all evil, while man's exploitation by the state is something quite natural.

It's embarrassing to live poor. People who offer their labor in the market want to live well, and they are happy with 25 rubles for a day's work in someone else's garden—perhaps in the future they might start up their own? A team of skilled builders contracting out to build a house can ask up to 100 rubles a person. You don't want it—don't take it, this is the market.

The employer also pays a broker—an intermediary knowing how much to offer, and to whom. But then, who does the broker pay?

No one knows, but no one interferes with his "life and work." Our state holds its nose as it passes by the market. It is of course illegal to send someone in your place to pick cotton for 300 rubles a month. But is it any more legal to force engineers to do agricultural work?

A legal labor exchange is better than an illegal one, but how do we make it legal? Well, we could establish a staff of administrators, inspectors, controllers and so on. But then the exchange would disappear. More precisely, it

would disappear from this particular place, to appear somewhere else once again—without the inspectors and controllers.

But we are in the process of transition to a market in which, as they say on the radio station "Europe Plus Moscow," "everything is different." A market in which we must create a complex of mechanisms which would make it advantageous for today's "unemployed" and tomorrow's jobless (they will exist, don't have any doubts about that) to register with a state labor exchange, since only it would be able to provide them the necessary minimum of social guarantees—the same kind of assistance as for example with medical insurance. Mechanisms of the sort where the hiring of a worker outside the labor exchange would carry the threat of serious unpleasantness to the entrepreneur, and the worker himself would lose his benefits. A client who rejects job proposals from the labor exchange three times might also be deprived of his benefits. Under such a regime, one would think that the help wanted posters will soon disappear, and at the same time the number of unemployed will decrease. Incidentally, a state labor exchange would also make things harder for dealers to profit from the problems of the people.

It would be better for the state to profit. Even though it doesn't deserve it.

Ukrainian Moratorium on Building AES, Radar Stations

90UN2666A Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian
8 Aug 90 p 2

[Decrees of the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet]

[Text] Moratorium on Building New AES on the Territory of the Ukrainian SSR

Based on the plenipotentiary powers granted by the people of the Ukraine, and taking into account the ecological crisis in this republic, as well as the saturation of its territory with nuclear reactors, the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet hereby decrees:

That a moratorium shall be declared on building new AES on the territory of the Ukrainian SSR, as well as on increasing the capacities of existing AES above those established on 1 August 1990 for a time period of five years.

This decree shall take effect from the moment it is adopted.

L. Kravchuk, chairman,
Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet.
Kiev, 2 August 1990.

* * *

Moratorium on Building New Superpower Radar Stations Within the Borders of the Territory of the Ukrainian SSR

Expressing the will of the Ukraine's people and taking into account the ecological crisis in this republic, the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet hereby decrees:

That a moratorium shall be declared for five years on building new, superpower radar stations within the borders of the territory of the Ukrainian SSR and on increasing the capacities of the existing radar stations above those set as of 1 August 1990.

This decree shall take effect from the moment it is adopted.

L. Kravchuk, chairman,
Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet.
Kiev, 2 August 1990.

Effects on Chernobyl in Bukovina

90UN2666B Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian
8 Aug 90 p 3

[Article by V. Pelekh, Ukrinform correspondent: "An Echo of the Chernobyl Disaster"]

[Text] The Chernobyl tragedy has also touched the land of Bukovina with its sinister wing. This was the conclusion reached by a commission of representatives from the republic- and oblast-level sanitation-epidemiological services, a commission which has been studying the status of the ecological environment in this region at the request of the local population.

The numerous measurements and investigatory tests on the soil, air, and water have shown that on the territory along the course of the Dnestr River above Chernovtsy the radiation background level is significantly higher than for the oblast as a whole. The cause of this is considered by the specialists to be the clouds, saturated with radioactive wastes, which were formed in the region of the accident and then moved for hundreds of kilometers and burst here with their devastatingly ruinous precipitations.

The territory around the village of Kiselev, Kitsmanskiy Rayon, suffered particularly from them. There are sections here which became so contaminated that they had to be taken out of economic use. Deep-level plowing under was done here in order to purify the land and return it to the crop rotation. Certain danger spots have also appeared here in population centers. Fortunately, the radiation level as a whole does not exceed the allowable norms. However, its constant or permanent effect does represent a threat to people's health and, in the first place, to the health of our youngest citizens. As confirmed by nurses and women in charge of the local kindergarten, the children under their care are already exhibiting an uncharacteristic sluggishness of movements, headaches, disorders of the thyroid glands, as well

as other negative symptoms. All this evokes concern, disturbance, and alarm among the local population.

An initiative group has been set up in this village; and it is demanding that the authorities declare Kiselev an ecological-disaster population center, and that its inhabitants be granted the privileges which are enjoyed by those who have suffered from the accident at the Chernobyl AES. Moreover, there are frequently various rumors and stories afloat that, under the conditions of insufficiently objective information, destabilize the situation in this village and hinder the people from living and working normally.

Hungary To Help Chernobyl Victims

90UN2666C Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian
25 Jul 90 p 2

[Ukrinform report: "Hungary To Help Chernobyl Victims"]

[Text] The Ukrainian SSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs has received a note from the General Consulate of the Republic of Hungary in Kiev. It reports on a decision taken by the government of the Republic of Hungary in response to the "Appeal of the Ukrainian SSR Council of Ministers to the Governments and Publics of Foreign Countries, and International Organizations," dated 9

April 1990. As is known, this appeal expressed a hope for help and cooperation from the international community in implementing the Comprehensive Program for Eliminating the Consequences of the Accident at the Chernobyl AES—a program which was developed in our republic.

The transmitted note says that the government of the Republic of Hungary has taken the decision to place at the disposal of the government of the Ukrainian SSR material aid amounting to 3 million forints; also it calls on the appropriate Hungarian ministries and departments—to render assistance from their own funds and within the framework of their own possibilities to those persons who have suffered as a result of the accident at the Chernobyl AES; it calls upon the appropriate Hungarian public organizations, as well as the Hungarian public, to join in with international actions directed at mitigating the fate of those persons who have suffered as a result of the accident at the Chernobyl AES.

The answering note from the Ukrainian SSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs contains gratitude in the name of the Ukrainian SSR Council of Ministers to the government of the Republic of Hungary for the decision which it has taken.

(UKRINFORM)

22161

59

NTIS
ATTN: PROCESS 103
5285 PORT ROYAL RD
SPRINGFIELD, VA

22161

This is a U.S. Government publication. Its contents in no way represent the policies, views, or attitudes of the U.S. Government. Users of this publication may cite FBIS or JPRS provided they do so in a manner clearly identifying them as the secondary source.

Foreign Broadcast Information Service (FBIS) and Joint Publications Research Service (JPRS) publications contain political, military, economic, environmental, and sociological news, commentary, and other information, as well as scientific and technical data and reports. All information has been obtained from foreign radio and television broadcasts, news agency transmissions, newspapers, books, and periodicals. Items generally are processed from the first or best available sources. It should not be inferred that they have been disseminated only in the medium, in the language, or to the area indicated. Items from foreign language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed. Except for excluding certain diacritics, FBIS renders personal and place-names in accordance with the romanization systems approved for U.S. Government publications by the U.S. Board of Geographic Names.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by FBIS/JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpts] in the first line of each item indicate how the information was processed from the original. Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear from the original source but have been supplied as appropriate to the context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by the source. Passages in boldface or italics are as published.

SUBSCRIPTION/PROCUREMENT INFORMATION

The FBIS DAILY REPORT contains current news and information and is published Monday through Friday in eight volumes: China, East Europe, Soviet Union, East Asia, Near East & South Asia, Sub-Saharan Africa, Latin America, and West Europe. Supplements to the DAILY REPORTs may also be available periodically and will be distributed to regular DAILY REPORT subscribers. JPRS publications, which include approximately 50 regional, worldwide, and topical reports, generally contain less time-sensitive information and are published periodically.

Current DAILY REPORTs and JPRS publications are listed in *Government Reports Announcements* issued semimonthly by the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), 5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield, Virginia 22161 and the *Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications* issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

The public may subscribe to either hardcover or microfiche versions of the DAILY REPORTs and JPRS publications through NTIS at the above address or by calling (703) 487-4630. Subscription rates will be

provided by NTIS upon request. Subscriptions are available outside the United States from NTIS or appointed foreign dealers. New subscribers should expect a 30-day delay in receipt of the first issue.

U.S. Government offices may obtain subscriptions to the DAILY REPORTs or JPRS publications (hardcover or microfiche) at no charge through their sponsoring organizations. For additional information or assistance, call FBIS, (202) 338-6735 or write to P.O. Box 2604, Washington, D.C. 20013. Department of Defense consumers are required to submit requests through appropriate command validation channels to DIA, RTS-2C, Washington, D.C. 20301. (Telephone: (202) 373-3771, Autovon: 243-3771.)

Back issues or single copies of the DAILY REPORTs and JPRS publications are not available. Both the DAILY REPORTs and the JPRS publications are on file for public reference at the Library of Congress and at many Federal Depository Libraries. Reference copies may also be seen at many public and university libraries throughout the United States.